

COMMITTEE DATE: 30/08/2017

Application Reference: 17/0301

WARD: Stanley
DATE REGISTERED: 05/05/17
LOCAL PLAN ALLOCATION: Countryside Area

APPLICATION TYPE: Full Planning Permission
APPLICANT: Denmack Holdings

PROPOSAL: Erection of four detached dwellinghouses, two with integral garages and two with detached garages, with associated landscaping and access from Stockydale Road.

LOCATION: LAND ADJACENT TO 27 STOCKYDALE ROAD, BLACKPOOL, FY4 5HP

Summary of Recommendation: Grant Permission

CASE OFFICER

Mr G Johnston

BLACKPOOL COUNCIL PLAN 2015 -2020

This application accords with **Priority one of the Plan** - The economy: Maximising growth and opportunity across Blackpool and **Priority two of the Plan** - Communities: Creating stronger communities and increasing resilience.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

The principle of developing the site for housing was established through outline planning permission reference 12/0896 albeit with access from Midgeland Road. Members have previously refused six houses fronting Stockydale Road with individual access points and no turning facilities (vehicles would have had to reverse onto Stockydale Road and delivery vehicles/bin lorries alight in Stockydale Road to load/unload). This proposal is for a less intensive development - four houses with one point of access, on site turning, room for delivery and bin lorries to alight clear of Stockydale Road, a widening of the road and a pavement along the site frontage and part of the eastern side of Stockydale Road. These are seen as benefits of the proposal relative to the previous refusal. Whilst the character of the lane would be temporarily affected by the removal of the hedgerow, a replacement hedgerow would be planted either side of the access and clear of the visibility splay to help integrate the development into its setting. On balance the application is recommended for approval.

INTRODUCTION

Members may recall that outline planning permission was granted for the former Baguleys Garden Centre site in November 2013 and subsequently a reserved matters application was approved on 27 September 2016.

The site has a history as outlined below:

The first application submitted in 2008 (reference 08/1181 which included six houses fronting Stockydale Road each with its own access to Stockydale Road) was refused by the Committee on the 23 February 2009 on the following grounds:

- the impact of the proposal on the character and function of the Countryside Area;
- the potential for the proposal to compromise a comprehensive and co-ordinated approach to the future development of the area;
- the potential for the proposal to prevent the appropriate planning of supporting infrastructure, services and facilities;
- the impact of the development on highway safety.

The second application submitted in 2010 (reference 10/0220 which included six houses fronting Stockydale Road with no direct access to Stockydale Road) was refused by Committee on the following eight grounds:

- insufficient information submitted;
- the impact of the proposal on the character and function of the Countryside Area;
- the potential for the proposal to compromise a comprehensive and co-ordinated approach to the future development of the area;
- the potential for the proposal to prevent the appropriate planning of supporting infrastructure, services and facilities;
- the applicant's failure to demonstrate that the development would not increase flooding;
- the applicant's failure to demonstrate that an appropriate level of affordable housing would be provided;
- the applicant's failure to demonstrate that an appropriate level of public open space would be provided;
- the detrimental impact that the development would have on residential amenity as a result of over-looking and over-shadowing.

A third outline application with all matters reserved was submitted in 2012 (reference 12/0894 which showed six houses fronting Stockydale Road with no direct access to Stockydale Road). The outline application for the erection of 36 dwellings was approved on 13th November 2013, subject to a number of conditions.

The approval of reserved matters application (reference 16/0196) was for 22 dwellings with five detached dwellings facing Stockydale Road but with no direct vehicular or pedestrian access to Stockydale Road and was approved on 28 September 2016.

The site is in two ownerships and the applicant owns that part of the site which fronts onto Stockydale Road. He wishes to develop this part of the site first and hence has applied for permission to erect four houses facing Stockydale Road but served by one access point.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is roughly rectangular and has a frontage of some 75 metres to Stockydale Road and a depth of some 60 metres. The site frontage comprises a hedgerow with a few trees in it. The land is primarily grassland and did not have any of the structures associated with Baguleys Garden Centre on it. There are three houses to the south of the site, one to the north and one opposite (which is also the base for a cat sanctuary).

DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

This is a full application for four five bedroom detached houses. The middle two houses would have integral garages and the end two houses would have a detached double garage each. The houses would be served by one access point from Stockydale Road and then a service road serving all four houses. The houses would therefore be set back between 25 and 30 metres from Stockydale Road. Stockydale Road would be widened along the site frontage and a pavement would be provided. Unfortunately this would necessitate the removal of the existing hedgerow and trees. However, a new hedgerow would be planted behind the pavement/visibility splay. The houses would be of brick and render construction with grey tile roofs and would incorporate gable features to the front elevation. The rear gardens would be in the region of 20 metres in length. The house at the southern end of the site would be approximately 5 metres from the rear garden boundary of the three houses to the south and the house at the northern end would be set away from the boundary approximately by 1 metre.

MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main planning issues are considered to be:

- principle of the development
- design of the development
- impact on residential amenity
- impact on highway safety
- other issues

These issues will be discussed in the assessment section of this report.

CONSULTATIONS

Head of Highways and Traffic Management: Comments on original application -The layout and geometry of Stockydale Road does not lend itself to additional development due to its narrow width. Stockydale Road is not wide enough for two-way traffic with poor provision for pedestrians and other road users. This currently creates issues and conflict between different road users, who include pedestrians, motorists, horse riders etc. Visibility

is also poor along this road due to high hedges and trees. Given the size of units proposed (five bedrooms), I expect future occupiers to have access to more than two cars resulting in additional vehicle trips to and from the site. On average, a domestic property creates eight vehicle trips per day meaning that this site will create 36 additional trips per day compounding existing problems in the area.

New footpaths shown on Stockydale Road which do not lead anywhere. I am concerned with where the bin store(s) are shown, immediately off Stockydale Road. On collection days, refuse vehicles will be stationary at this point for short periods leading to highway safety concerns - drivers may not expect stationary vehicles at this point. The application form states 24 car parking spaces? is this correct?

On this basis, I wish to object to this proposal.

Comments on the revised application

Comments will be reported in the Update Note.

Service Manager Public Protection: Due to the historic land use of the property a Phase 1 Desk Study is required. If the Desk Study shows there to be a likelihood of contamination being present then this needs to be followed by a Phase 2 Investigation. If the Phase 2 shows that there are increased levels in contaminants then a remediation study is to be produced and approved by the Local Authority prior to any works commencing.

United Utilities: United Utilities has no objections to the proposed development.

Electricity North West Ltd: We have considered the planning application and find it could have an impact on our infrastructure.

The development is shown to be adjacent to or affect Electricity North West operational land or electricity distribution assets. Where the development is adjacent to operational land the applicant must ensure that the development does not encroach over either the land or any ancillary rights of access or cable easements. If planning permission is granted the applicant should verify such details by contacting Electricity North West, Estates and Wayleaves, Frederick Road, Salford, Manchester M6 6QH.

The applicant should be advised that great care should be taken at all times to protect both the electrical apparatus and any personnel working in its vicinity.

The applicant should also be referred to two relevant documents produced by the Health and Safety Executive, which are available from The Stationery Office Publications Centre and The Stationery Office Bookshops, and advised to follow the guidance given.

The documents are as follows:-

HS(G)47 - Avoiding danger from underground services.

GS6 - Avoidance of danger from overhead electric lines.

Other points, specific to this particular application are:-

There are LV AND 6.6kV cables along Stockydale Road. There is an LV service point and associated cable west of the proposed development boundary (near the side parallel to Midgeland Road).

The applicant should also be advised that, should there be a requirement to divert the apparatus because of the proposed works, the cost of such a diversion would usually be borne by the applicant. The applicant should be aware of our requirements for access to inspect, maintain, adjust, repair, or alter any of our distribution equipment. This includes carrying out works incidental to any of these purposes and this could require works at any time of day or night. Our Electricity Services Desk (Tel No. 0800 195 4141) will advise on any issues regarding diversions or modifications.

It is recommended that the applicant give early consideration in project design as it is better value than traditional methods of data gathering. It is, however, the applicant's responsibility to demonstrate the exact relationship on site between any assets that may cross the site and any proposed development.

Waste Services Manager: The applicant has given consideration to refuse collection and storage for the new dwellings with the plans showing space for bin storage.

The space provided needs to be sufficient for the storage of potentially twelve 240 litre wheeled bins which will also be required to be purchased at £30 per bin upon completion.

PUBLICITY AND REPRESENTATIONS

Press notice published: Not applicable in this case

Site notice displayed: 16 May 2017

Neighbours notified: 9 May 2017 and 31 July 2017

Mrs Julie Birkett 46 Stockydale Road, Blackpool, FY4 5HR (Objects)

Original comments

I object to the proposed development of four large detached properties opening onto Stockydale Road.

This development was approved only as part of a larger development opening onto Midgeland Road. Midgeland Road is infinitely better for vehicular access. The proposed development of the very large residential dwellings will attract owners with two/three cars each plus visitors, deliveries etc. As Stockydale Road is an unsuitable narrow lane for extra traffic and will be spoiled by this development please address the following points:

1. Why is Stockydale Road considered a suitable access point for 10-15 additional vehicles daily?
2. What measures are being put in place to alleviate the risk of accidents at the blind corner by No.30 Stockydale Road where vehicles/horse riders/cyclists already meet head on

because of congested parking issues on that stretch of Stockydale Road?

3. Is the proposed access and parking provision within the site adequate to ensure that no cars/vehicles will have to park on Stockydale Road? It does not look sufficient. Modern housing developments always have parking problems but in this case there is nowhere else for the traffic to go.

I note there are garages but inevitably these are often used for storage not parking vehicles.

4. Please consider better parking provision or a reduction in the number of approved dwellings. If you do not propose any change to the proposed development please explain why.

5. The scale of the development and entrance onto the lane will adversely affect the street scene and whilst the plan shows that a hedge will remain abutting the boundary of Stockydale Road, the plan indicates this will be a maximum of 1m. I appreciate that this may be part of a visibility splay for access however please can the Council consider a minimum height of hedge, say 1m, to ensure the impact on the street scene and locality is best managed. If you do not propose to make any change please explain why.

Comment submitted 11 August 2017

I have reviewed the Design and Access Statement dated July 2017. I still object to the proposed development.

I note that the revised plan contains a new hedge 1.8m in height. Whilst this new hedge would be much smaller than the current hedge it's better than the 'less than 1m' originally planned at first glance. However it does absolutely nothing to retain the 'rural character of the lane' given that it will abut a new 1.8m pavement for the full length of the site. The only way to retain the rural character of the lane is to access the proposed development from Midgeland Road which was how the site was given permission in the first place, albeit as part of the adjacent 'Baguleys' development.

I strongly request that the Council considers insisting that the development on this site can only be approved via an access from Midgeland Road as per the original approval. I note that L. Patel, Head of Transportation, Blackpool Council, supports this view and objects to the development on the basis of the traffic concerns. He suggests 36 additional trips to the site per day. More traffic, more people. I hope the planning department consider this professional objection with some weight as it reflects the 17 objections from neighbours who live on and use this road. I note that no-one has supported this application.

No amendment to the plan or in the statement resolves these issues. There is no reduction in number of dwellinghouses or alternative access point proposed. This application should be refused in its present form. I am also concerned that the statement refers to other imminent development on the lane. I am not aware of this planning application(s) and would like details of this or pre-application enquires. The applicant appears to be relying on this to support his application.

The proposed changes to the lane do not fit in with the 'Marton Moss Countryside Area' plans created by the Council. I would also point out that the footpaths outside properties such as mine were part of previous Council planning conditions not a desire by owners to create an urban environment.

I reiterate, please refuse this development unless access is provided from Midgeland Road.

Mr Garry Collins The Barn, 40 Stockydale Road, Blackpool, FY4 5HR (Objects)

Original comments

I object to the proposed development with access on to Stockydale Road.

The size of houses on the proposed application 17/0301 is totally inappropriate and not in keeping with others on the application given permission 16/0196, and as such will lead to car parking issues on Stockydale Road creating road safety and access problems both in to the new development and to existing properties.

The original application with access on to Stockydale Road was refused and permission was only granted with access on to Midgeland Road which is better suited to take the extra traffic. Midgeland Road is the only safe access point for this development.

The proposed footpath on the east side of Stockydale Road will narrow the road significantly forcing traffic into the centre of a blind bend, surely this is not practical or acceptable?

Stockydale is a narrow lane frequently used by dog walkers, children and horse riders, any extra traffic would make the lane dangerous. The plan shows the existing hedgerows adjacent to the road to be cut down to a maximum of 1 metre, this would be detrimental to the rural character and appearance of the lane.

Comment submitted 10 August 2017

I object to the amended plans for this application.

The proposed widened footpath will inevitably be used for parking on as is the case further down on Stockydale Road, this will make it difficult for vehicles to pass and create a blind entrance into the new development. The wide entrance and pavements are not in keeping with a rural lane.

I also note that due to the huge size of the proposed houses and the fact this is now a separate application to the original development on Baguleys that circa six houses will be lost compared to the original application, surely with the current housing shortage the site is better utilized with the Midgeland Road development.

Mr David Buckley 15 Stockydale Rd, Marton, Blackpool, FY4 5HW (Objects)

Original comments

In previous planning applications to build on this site, it was made quite clear that no right of way would be given off Stockydale Road. Through what is probably one of the oldest hedge rows on the Fylde.

Not only would it spoil what is a quite country lane, but the addition traffic to four ...five bedroom houses well the road just could not cope. Having lived on Stockydale Road for more than forty years I feel very strongly that this would completely spoil the area. As for the builders access to this with all those deliveries, down the lane and past where I live is too much to bear.

Previous applications across the site of the former garden centre, made no real impact on the traffic situation in the area. But this surely would, there are very few leafy lanes left on the Fylde. Please save this one.

Comment submitted 10 August 2017

I do object very strongly with the application to build four dwellings with direct access to Stockydale Road. The road is very narrow to say the least, with tall hedges and a very sharp 90 degree bend on the approach. The idea of removing hedges and building pavements to nowhere is ridiculous. Faced with cars parking to access the Fury tails cats home and on street parking on Stockydale Road, at times it's almost impossible to pass down the lane. But the biggest threat to us residents is now the development of the surrounding area, with people using Stockydale Road as a short cut to the motorway avoiding the traffic lights on Progress Way. As for the very heavy lorries, misguided by sat nav and poor signs on the approaches they all too often block the road. We all feel as residents that this extra burden on the traffic situation would be too much.

Mrs Linda Collins 40 Stockydale Road, Blackpool, FY4 5HR (Objects)

Original comments

I object to the above development opening onto Stockydale Road.

The original development on this land had vehicular access from Midgeland Road which is much better able to take the additional traffic. An increase in traffic on Stockydale Road will be dangerous. Stockydale Road is a narrow road with two dangerous bends already.

Please address my concerns:

1. I can see on the plan there appears to be a pavement at the narrow bend. Does this mean that the existing hedges are being removed?
2. Is the opening onto Stockydale Road wide enough for the traffic proposed?
3. How high are the hedges on Stockydale Road going to be? The plan says 1m maximum which indicates this could be much less. This would ruin the existing lane.
4. The very large properties proposed will inevitably have 2/3 cars each and visitors. Is the Council intending to reduce the speed limit on Stockydale Road?
5. Is the Council proposing to keep Stockydale Road as a through road or is there an

intention to make it a cul-de-sac with the increased traffic?

Comment submitted 10 August 2017

I strongly object to the latest amended plan.

I am concerned the proposed new wide footpath opposite my property will be used for parking cars on creating more problems for large delivery vehicles e.g. heating oil tanker

As before, I ask is Stockydale Road going to be a through Road or a cul-de-sac? and a slower speed limit put in place.

Mr John Rose 38 Stockydale Road, Blackpool, FY4 5HR (Objects)

Original comments

I object to this proposed planning application with access onto Stockydale Road. The dangerous corners, width and condition of the road are not suitable for any more traffic. It is common sense that should any dwellings be built on this land access should be via Midgeland Road. It should be noted no access at all has been granted onto Stockydale Road with the development of Magnolia Point.

Regarding our recent telephone conversations. From what you say you are still waiting for a reply from United Utilities confirming that they have found another sewer pipe under Stockydale Road and you might not have to demolish our buildings as was required in the earlier planning application. You also say the Highways department have not yet been to assess the dangerous bend on the corner of Stockydale Road. I look forward to an updated reply.

Comment submitted 10 August 2017

I have asked a friend who is a Chartered Engineer, with considerable highways and traffic management experience and local knowledge, for his views on the proposed development and my comments, below, reflect the advice that I have been given.

At the time of writing, your highways consultee's position on the original application has not been made public although I believe that I understand his view. An amended plan (ostensibly agreed with him) has now been submitted - so we have no way of knowing the Council's present position.

First of all, my friend is of the view that Stockydale Road is unsuitable for the construction traffic - in either direction from the site. Neither part of Stockydale Road has footways. Both directions present very significant difficulties with forward visibility. The northern route is already and quite clearly structurally compromised. The southern route involves a 90 degree bend and a significant length fully parked up with the cars of residents who have no alternative space.

Significant lengths of Stockydale Road are too narrow for HGVs to pass other vehicles without damaging verges, hedges and, potentially, utilities including lighting. In some lengths it is too narrow for cars to pass.

Our interpretation of the original Design and Access Statement is that the site would be accessed from Stockydale Road for construction purposes - although it is not explicit. The amended version is no more clear. However, if permission is given for this proposal it becomes a separate entity to the "Baguleys" site (16/0196) and may have no access from that side of course.

I am aware that objectors believe that the existing hedge fronting the site should be retained intact and I share that view. It is interesting that the planning authority also share the view - having conditioned application 16/0196 to prevent the loss or penetration of the hedge.

I do not need to argue the value of the hedge at this point, since others have done that. The hedge was proposed to be retained, in a somewhat tongue in cheek proposal, cut down to a metre high. Regardless of the stopping sight distance adopted for the evaluation of the entrance the visibility requirement is for a driver, with eyes at one metre above ground (actually 1.050 metres) to be able to see an object at the stopping sight distance some 600 millimetres above ground on the line of the nearside kerb. If the hedge was retained at one metre high this is clearly impossible. It is, of course, possible if the hedge were to have been maintained at a height never greater than 600 millimetres. To achieve this it would be necessary to cut it down to about 400-500 millimetres or less every few weeks. I doubt very much if it is acceptable, in terms of the effect on nesting birds, to cut it often enough to achieve a maximum of 600 millimetres. It was preposterous and demonstrates that it was never a serious proposition.

So - the proposal to cut it down to a metre high was clearly not practical or practicable. I doubt if it was ever serious. I believe that it was intended simply as a patronising gesture to get over the first hurdle by making a concession. If this was not the case it would have been exceedingly naive. We did not see, then, that there was any prospect of the present hedge being retained if the application was to be approved. Nevertheless it was represented as agreed with the Council's officers.

It is now proposed that the existing hedge be removed and somehow replaced further back at a height of 1.8 metres – less than its present height. I cannot imagine that the replacement hedge would be allowed to mature to the standard of the existing. It would not, therefore, go anywhere near retaining a rural character.

The Council's usual condition on landscaping is to retain it for five years, as I understand. It will not even have reached maturity in that time and then could be taken away. Let's be honest, the objective is to sell big houses at a premium in a semi-rural location and the new owners would not want to be concealed behind a hedge. A new hedge is not, then, a long term or even serious proposition - just a means of trying to offset objections.

In the amended Design and Access Statement the developer refers to various houses with widening of the road and substantial brick walls, suggesting that the comparison makes their proposal somehow more acceptable. This is not a precedent of any kind. It derived from the early 20th century Blackpool Improvement Acts which required highway

"Improvement Lines" to be observed. These requirements disappeared with the enactment of the County of Lancashire Act (in the 1980's I think) and the widenings and oversize brick walls ceased at that point.

Returning to the stopping sight distance: my understanding is that the frontage is about 78 metres long - sufficient for an SSD for traffic with an 85%ile speed of 28 mph and no more. We have seen no evidence of vehicle speed measurements and recent traffic diversions have led to an increased use of Stockydale Road as a short cut. Whilst my evidence is anecdotal I can advise that there have been four cats run over outside our property in the last six months - whereas my experience over many years is that the number would typically be no more than one a year - if any. I believe that this is indicative of vehicle speeds and flows increasing. I also believe that the loss of the perceived narrowing caused by the hedge would increase vehicle speeds further. I understand this to be the conventional wisdom deriving from experience of traffic calming.

We now understand that the developer has discovered a degree of encroachment of the verge into the carriageway, leaving a slightly greater width available at the proposed entrance. I am not sure what significance this has at all. The visibility requirements are what they are, the turning width requirement can be met by adjusting the design of the entrance. Widening the carriageway simply invites a further increase in vehicle speed before it narrows in either direction. If this were in some way beneficial would the developer undertake to maintain it at that width? Of course not. Interestingly we appear to be trying to increase vehicle speeds and encourage pedestrians to cross at the same point. If it were in some way beneficial we would expect that the Council, as highway authority would be doing this right across the Moss.

The apparently inevitable loss of the hedge exposes, as I assume was always really intended, the proposed grand entrance to view. I take this to be a major selling point. It is difficult to comment on the entrance given the sketchy nature of the drawing that we have seen. It really does the developer no credit that he has assumed that no-one would work it out. I expect that the agent will put something together in more detail when it is too late for anyone to comment further.

I have to say that we find it absolutely staggering that the original access arrangement had already been "agreed in principle" with Mr Johnston and Miss Johnson, at least according to the application documentation.

We now find, in the amended Design and Access Statement, that the amendments are put forward "Following further consultation with the planning department and agreements reached with advisory highways and United Utilities agencies, and in consideration of the letters of objection the following measures have been introduced." So the amendments are agreed with the Council's highways people already and somehow purport to deal with the objections. We must conclude this because there is no advisory highways agency of which we are aware.

We had seen the presently approved development (16/0196) as establishing Stockydale Road as a natural and, in development control terms, defensible boundary to the Moss.

The developer obviously knows more than we do. The amended Design and Access Statement says that "The impending redevelopment of the site to the south east and opposite the site is imminent." I find this particularly interesting because, of course, I own the site across the road. For the redevelopment of my land, or that of Mr Hill next door, to be impending or imminent would require planning permission, as I understand the rules. I am not aware of any such permission. I assume that any such redevelopment is simply an aspiration of the developer – or someone he knows. The curious reference to the impending redevelopments across the road continue in: "That, in conjunction with the proposal, will include the provision of a 1.5m footpath to the section of Stockdale Road that connects the proposal site to the pedestrian footpath system at the tight bend in Stockdale Road." Why in heaven's name would anyone suggest that they put in a substandard unconnected footway next to a substandard carriageway? Why would anyone think that crossing a road twice at a point with very limited visibility is a selling point? Surely the Council has not agreed?

On the issue of pedestrians and footways the picture is very strange. We have a footway proposed along the frontage of the site, originally actually behind a hedge. The ends of this token footway abut the fences of private gardens of other properties - so obscuring all pedestrians from the driver's view as the vehicles approach the site. These boundaries are outwith the red edge and not within the highway. They are, then, not controllable. The existing boundary treatments are high enough to hide adults - let alone child pedestrians. Yet we are expected to believe that getting people to cross there is a good idea. I have been told to avoid using phrases like "before someone gets killed" but, let's be honest, this is not a good idea at all.

The footway proposed southward, toward the right angle bend where pedestrians must cross back, must require the removal of more hedge or a narrowing of the carriageway. The former is clearly most undesirable and the latter, frankly, ridiculous. When they "land" on the inside of the 90 degree bend, there is no footway to speak of anyway. There is no purpose served by introducing a footway to the south on the opposite side of the road. The connection of the site to the rest of the area, for pedestrians, would be far more readily and effectively achieved by a footway west to Midgeland Road, within the "Baguleys" site. This is achievable so far as we are aware, with a minor modification to 16/0196 if necessary. It is our impression that the Runnell Farm site was set out in that way.

The original Design and Access Statement indicated that "The revised [from 16/0196] proposal is to convert the site to provide a high standard residential development that is in keeping with the area and most importantly maintain a usage to the site that prevents the general trend of dereliction that is prevalent in many proximate locations within the Marton Moss area, in two stages". The word "proximate" quite clearly means next; nearest; immediately before or after in order, place, occurrence, etc. So there are not that many proximate locations. The applicant is saying, then, that the adjacent properties contribute to an air of dereliction. My property is across the road and neither derelict nor approaching dereliction. Of the two houses abutting the site on the same side I believe that one was actually built by Mr Mackay and the other has had the benefit of considerable investment.

Neither appear to be part of a trend of dereliction. I find the idea of "maintaining a usage" somewhat strange - given that this is a change from the existing use.

Supporting documentation also indicates that "It is certainly our intention to retain as much of the character of the lane as possible ..." Let's be honest - no it is not their intention to do any such thing. They just want to get an approval that means they need to take out the hedge to, then, open up a grand entrance - as apparently already agreed in principle. They also wish to rip out another hedge to introduce a second token and substandard footway - that will serve no purpose.

We note that the proposed kerb radii at the access are somewhat generous compared to the more modest radii that might normally be required for what is little more than a shared drive. This invites higher entry and exits speeds than are necessary or desirable. I assume that the construction of the access and the construction of the footway on the east side would be the subject of agreements under the Highways Act. I trust that the detailed design (if it does go ahead) will not be agreed behind closed doors but will, first, be the subject of a condition to be formally discharged.

There are drainage matters on which I would comment, were there anything to see - although it all appears to be agreed with UU.

To summarise:

- It is wholly inappropriate to use Stockydale Road as an access simply to increase the value of the proposed houses.
- It is wholly inappropriate to use Stockydale Road as an access for any construction traffic.
- It was probably always known to be impossible to retain any part of the frontage hedge and achieve visibility standards and it is equally impossible to retain any part of the hedge where the footway is proposed on the east side - so much for rural character.
- The proposal actually introduces risks to pedestrians as well as vehicle occupants.
- We believe that the originally supposed retention of the hedge is a red herring that the developer knows is ridiculous - but understand from the documentation that the Planning Authority had apparently been persuaded to agree in principle.
- We now understand that highways officers have agreed to the amended design of the access - again from the documentation.
- The apparently agreed principle of an access at this point is entirely unacceptable and potentially dangerous.
- There is no scope within the applicant's control to mitigate the dangers arising from the proposed access.
- The proposal is a very significant and very sad precedent if approved.
- The application documentation is grossly misleading and deliberately so unless extensive and unreasonable agreements have already been reached with Council officers.

My wife and myself have found reading about the application and its predecessor most stressful. We are still not aware of what is happening with the proposed sewer requisition for 16/0196. It seems to me, then, that it is reasonable to ask what progress has been made on that. You may take that as a request under the Freedom of Information Act. I have to say that I find it most disturbing to have to write in these terms. The proposal is nothing more than an opportunistic attempt to squeeze a bit more money out of a site by pushing the

Council's policies out of the way. I sincerely hope that what is represented as being agreed with Council officers has not been so agreed and that the proposal is found to be unacceptable and is refused. It seems to me, in this context, that it is also reasonable to ask what has actually been agreed with the developer on 17/0301 – whether formally or informally documented. You may take that as a request under the Freedom of Information Act too.

Mr Michael Denness 27 Stockydale Road, Blackpool, FY4 5HP (Objects)

Original Comments

I would like to object to the proposed development plan number 17/0301 Land adjacent to 27 Stockydale Road.

Below are my reasons and concerns

1. The land that this application applies to has previously applied for planning permission with access onto Stockydale Road and been turned down by the Planning Committee on two separate planning applications...
Application 08/1181 paragraph 4 (please see your records).
Application 10/0220 refused (please see your records).

After these two refusals a further application 12/0894 for this site was submitted and granted but with only vehicular access from Midgeland Road . Another further application 16/0196 for this site was again submitted and granted, and once again with no access onto Stockydale Road, paragraph 5 (please see your records)

What are the circumstances that have changed that would now allow this development to be accessed from Stockydale Road?

2. The entrance of the proposed site is to be gained via an agricultural entrance, thus changing it into a domestic entrance, which I understand to be classed as three times busier. Due to the size of the proposed properties I can only surmise the amount of added traffic and cars will impact greatly on this entrance and lane.

Access to the first 200 yards of Stockydale Road from Midgeland Road has a mix of terraced, semi and detached housing, with parking on both sides of the road. Stockydale Road then turns sharp left via a blind corner. The proposed development does not provide any details of the safety features they intend to provide for the safety of pedestrian's, horse riders etc.

3. The position of the proposed new footpath on the opposite side of the road from the development the will require the hedgerow to be removed or the lane narrowed. There are no details within the proposal describing how this will impact on the existing users of this road. Will traffic calming features be introduced?

4. The existing trees and fence line which abut my property on the southern boundary have been maintained by myself for the past 13 years but are not shown on the plan that has been submitted. The trees to the rear of my garage appear to be on the other side of a new

fence, and the trees at the front of my garage and the road no longer appear on the plan. This has been done without discussion or consultation with myself. According to the proposed plan the detached garage at house number 4 appears to be on my property.

Comment submitted 09 August 2017

In response to the amendments submitted by the applicant, I still wish to object to the proposed development.

Stockydale Road is not wide enough to allow all modes of vehicles to pass each other safely. The council/highways have had their own signage in place at both ends of Stockydale Road for some time now stating that the road is unsuitable for heavy vehicles. What has changed? The proposed footpath could cause more problems on this section of road as it may encourage street parking.

The construction of this site will require machinery, equipment and materials to be delivered. How does the council see this being done in a safe manner with the evidence of two blind corners, one at the south end and one at the north end of Stockydale Road. Will the Planning Committee visit this site to view the road and recognise and acknowledge the road safety issues this build will have on vehicles, pedestrians, horse riders etc.

There have been measurements submitted which appear to have been taken in only a small section of the road. Who conducted these measurements? Did an independent party carry them out? Will the whole length of Stockydale road be measured even at its narrowest width? Will the planning department or highways undertake this step? The land that this application applies to has on two previous occasions had planning permission turned down 08/1181 and 10/0220 please see your comments and findings as to your reasons in both cases. What has changed?

A detached garage on the amended plans has been resited. The boundary between my property still appears incorrect It is clearly shown on an office copy of the Land registry title plan I obtained on and dated 2/8/2017.

Mr Andrew Dickman 30 Stockydale Road, Blackpool, FY4 5HW (Objects)

Original comments

I would like to state my concerns over the application in its present form.

This development was granted permission in an earlier application (160196) with access from Midgeland Road and the relevant houses then to be facing West with rear gardens abutting the hedgerow on Stockydale Road. This would leave the present hedgerow there intact. I believe the access to the proposed development from Stockydale Road has twice been refused in previous applications due to the narrow width of the road and the 90 degree bend at the junction of New Hall Avenue North. I cannot see what has changed since the previous refusals. The proposed new footpath on the Eastern side of the road could not be of adequate width without destroying the tall hedgerow on that side. For these reasons I object to the application in its present form.

Comment submitted 09 August 2017

I would like to voice my concern over the amended layout proposal for the above application.

The widening of access locally at the point of entry to the site does not alleviate or change the fundamental problems which would be caused by this proposed development. The width of Stockydale Road over the majority of its length, from the 90 degree blind corner at its junction with New Hall Avenue North to its junction with Jubilee Lane, does not permit passing two way traffic. In addition there is a further 'blind' bend further down the road near Jubilee Lane. Passing is only made possible by some short wider areas which are mainly at the opening to existing properties. This problem is often compounded by horse riders, pedestrians and heavy traffic, despite signs stating the road is unsuitable for HGVs. As there is no footpath along this length as a whole, the proposed path would not improve safety for road users. Even with the suggested additional parking there would be an incremental rise in the traffic flow throughout the length of the road.

As stated in his objection to this development in June, Mr L. Patel of the Highways Department. "The layout and geometry does not lend itself to additional development due to its narrow width. Stockydale Road is not wide enough for two-way traffic, with poor provision for pedestrians and other road users." Plus " New footpaths shown on Stockydale Road which do not lead anywhere." He also states that the development would "cause additional trips per day which would compound existing problems in this area "This amended application only marginally alleviates the access/road width problem at the site entrance and does not solve the increase in traffic and risks to safety along the length of Stockydale Road. There is also the proposed destruction of long existing hedgerows on both sides of the road. That would greatly detract from the semi-rural aspect of the area.

Mrs E Forshaw 18 Stockydale Road, Blackpool, FY4 5HW (Objects)**Original comments**

I am writing to you, with my concerns, regarding the revised plans for the above area. I reside at 18 Stockydale Road. I own my home and have lived here for more than 20 years .I am a driver and use the lane side of Stockydale Road on a daily basis. What you are proposing would be extremely dangerous, it is a narrow winding country road, it is used by pedestrians, dog walkers, horse riders and of course us residents, it is also used a lot these days as a rat run to the motorway with drivers using speeds unsuitable for a lane , as it is really , we are also getting HGV traffic , whose sat navs are bringing them down, so even now there are problems with vehicles getting stuck, and us all having to put our cars on the pavement one evening to let one through. Your proposed access just fills us with dread it would be: An accident waiting to happen. Hope you will consider all of this very carefully.

Mrs Joan Cherry 6a George Ave, Blackpool, FY4 5JR (Objects)**Original comments**

I am writing to object to the above planning application

As both a pedestrian and a driver along this lane when I visit family, my primary concern with this planning application is to mine and other users safety. This site on two subsequent

applications has been refused permission due to the unsuitable access onto Stockydale Road.

There are no pavements on this lane but I noted one has been suggested on this application. I ask the question what is the point of this footpath if it joins onto no other and would it also narrow the road with its construction? I was under the impression footpaths needed to be a certain width to be fit for purpose. Does this proposed footpath meet with those specifications? Since the development of Magnolia Point with the addition of over 80 new homes I have noticed a rise in pedestrians, dog walkers etc. all now using Stockydale Road. What consideration has been given to their safety.

This project will need and require an awful lot of heavy construction traffic bringing both equipment and materials to site. How is the access to the proposed site from Stockydale Road suitable or safe for this? What safety measures or consideration are being put in place?

Have any studies or inspections taken place to the original construction of this section of Stockydale Road, to accommodate the heavy traffic required to service the site? The road already has in place signs put up by the Council advising unsuitable for heavy vehicles. Is it not therefore better to continue with the plans already granted and in place with access from Midgeland Road to this site?

Once again it is proposed to interfere with a mature and longstanding hedgerow in a rural setting .Even though it is proposed to cut the hedge to 1 metre high this will remove and disrupt sufficient nesting, and once again wildlife in the Marton Moss area will be affected. Have any studies taken place?

Comment submitted 08 August 2017

I am writing to object once again in response to the amendments submitted for the above planning application.

As stated previously I am both a pedestrian and a driver along this lane when I visit family, my primary concern with this planning application is to mine and other users' safety. This site on two subsequent applications has been refused permission due to the unsuitable access onto Stockydale Road.

I do not feel any more confident with submitted revisions to safety issues.

I note a footpath widening has been suggested in front of this site, but this still doesn't answer the question what is the point of this footpath if it joins onto no other and would it also narrow the road with its construction? I am concerned that the mature longstanding hedgerow will be removed to construct this footpath.

I was under the impression footpaths needed to be a certain width to be fit for purpose. I note measurements have been submitted of the road in front of the site. Are these accurate measurements and will the council or highways be undertaking a full survey confirming accurate measurements.

Since the development of Magnolia Point with the addition of over 80 new homes I have noticed a rise in pedestrians, dog walkers etc. all now using Stockydale Road. What consideration has been given to their safety.

As stated previously this project will need and require an awful lot of heavy construction traffic bringing both equipment and materials to site.

How is the access to the proposed site from Stockydale Road suitable or safe for this? What safety measures or consideration are being put in place?

Have any studies or inspections taken place to the original construction of this section of Stockydale Road, to accommodate the heavy traffic required to service the site? The road already has in place signs put up by the council stating road is unsuitable for heavy vehicles. Does the council still agree with its own previous findings which led to the erections of these signs.

Heavy vehicles bringing materials, machinery and equipment will all have to access the site via blind and sharp bends at either end of Stockydale Road.

Has the Council made any considerations to road upgrade or repairs that subsequently could be needed if the site is granted.

This site has had previous applications rejected over the unsuitable access .I therefore ask the question of the Council even with these amendments what has changed?

Mr Andrew Greenwood, 50 Stockydale Road, Blackpool, FY4 5HR (Objects)

Original comments

I am writing to object to the above planning application for the following reasons.

The proposal concerns development of land adjacent to 27 Stockydale Rd. This land lies within the Marton Moss strategic site (Map 04 of the Core Strategy policies maps). The proposal appears to be contrary to the Blackpool Local Plan policy for Marton Moss (CS26), the principle points of which are:-

1. The character of the remaining lands at Marton Moss is integral to the local distinctiveness of Blackpool and as such is valued by the local community. A neighbourhood planning approach will be promoted for this area to develop neighbourhood policy which supports the retention and enhancement of the distinctive character, whilst identifying in what circumstances development including residential may be acceptable.

2. Prior to developing a local policy framework through the neighbourhood planning process development on the remaining lands of the Moss will be limited to:

Conversion or change of use of existing buildings for agricultural or horticultural purposes

Outdoor recreational uses appropriate to a rural area

New homes that meet the requirements of NPPF paragraph 55 Extensions or replacement

dwellings in keeping with the scale and character of the area and not exceeding 35% of the original ground floor footprint of the existing dwelling.

New homes meeting NPPF paragraph 55 should be :-

- Be truly outstanding or innovative, helping to raise the standards of design more generally in rural areas;
- Reflect the highest standards in architecture;
- Significantly enhance the immediate setting;
- Be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.

This proposed development does not appear innovative, is not exciting new architecture, and will destroy rather than enhance the rural setting.

3. Stockydale road has two distinct sections. Where it joins Midgeland Road it is a very typical urban street, however at its eastern end it make a very sharp left turn and transforms into a country lane, a rural survivor from a much older time. It is very narrow and unsuitable for anything other than light vehicle use. A road sign at the access to the road states that it is unsuitable for heavy vehicles.

4. The proposal will double the number of residences on the west side of the rural section of the road. The road is so narrow that vehicles cannot pass except with considerable care, and there is no provision for pedestrians. Has any assessment been made of traffic levels and the expected increase? Has any assessment been made of the impact on pedestrian and equestrian use of the road, which has increased following additional use by residents of Magnolia Point?

5. Both ends of Stockydale Road have very sharp narrow blind corners, with no footpath. The proposal shows a new footpath at the southern end.

Will there be a similar path at the northern sharp corner? The southern path (3 on the plan) will make the road even narrower. According to the Highways Agency the absolute minimum width for a footpath is 1000mm. How wide is the path proposed to be? After constructing the path how much road will remain? When will the path be built? This project will require a lot of construction traffic. The combination of heavy construction traffic, a narrow blind corner and no footpath will at the very least pose a serious and foreseeable danger to life. Will the remaining road (after path construction) be wide enough to carry the heavy construction traffic?

What studies have been made about the strength and stability of Stockydale Road? It is very old - will it disintegrate under the additional construction traffic? If so who will be responsible for reconstruction and restoration of the road?

6. There have been previous applications to develop this site, 08/1181, 10/0220, 12/0894 and 16/0196. These were refused for a number of reasons including but not limited to access. What has changed to enable planning permission to be granted?

7. It is proposed to reduce the height of the hedge to 1.0m in the area of access to the

proposed site. I understand that this is necessary for safety and that the lower hedge height will need to be maintained, however it will completely change the nature of the road.

Comment submitted 08 August 2017

I am writing to object to the above planning application for the following reasons. Same reasons 1-2 outlined above and

3. Whilst the amendment proposes widening the road around the development it does not address the narrow constrictions at the north and south end of the road. Unless the whole road is widened it would remain unsuitable and dangerous for additional development. The application states that the road is 5m wide. It is not. A road sign at the access to the road states that it is unsuitable for heavy vehicles.

4. The amended proposal will double the number of residences on the west side of the rural section of the road. The road is so narrow that vehicles cannot pass except with considerable care, and there is no provision for pedestrians. The amendment does not challenge or satisfy this objection. Has any assessment been made of traffic levels and the expected increase? Has any assessment been made of the impact on pedestrian and equestrian use of the road, which has increased following additional use by residents of Magnolia Point?

5. Both ends of Stockydale road have very sharp narrow blind corners, with no footpath. The proposal shows a new footpath at the southern end.

Will there be a similar path at the northern sharp corner? The amendment does not show one. The road at this point is extremely narrow. The road may have changed following the culvert construction by Kensington however the plans should address the road as it is, not how the developer would like it to be.

The southern path (3 on the plan) will make the road even narrower. The amendment will reduce the width of the road at the bend by 1500mm. After constructing the path how much road will remain? The amendment mentions a further development on Stockydale Road, also within the Marton Moss strategic site. This additional proposal should be treated separately and on its own merits and not used to support 17/0301. When will the path be built? The amendment is not clear. Any additional footpath should be constructed before any development of the site. The combination of heavy construction traffic, a narrow blind corner and no footpath will at the very least pose a serious and foreseeable danger to life. Will the remaining road (after path construction) be wide enough to carry the heavy construction traffic? The amendment does not address possible issues about the strength and stability of Stockydale Road. It is very old - will it disintegrate under the additional construction traffic? If so who will be responsible for reconstruction and restoration of the road?

6. There have been previous applications to develop this site, 08/1181, 10/0220, 12/0894 and 16/0196. These were refused for a number of reasons including but not limited to access. What has changed to enable planning permission to be granted?

7. The amendment to increase the height of the hedge to 1.8m in the area of access to the

proposed site is welcome, however being set back it will completely change the nature of the road.

Mrs C Baron 20 Stockydale Road, Blackpool, FY4 5HW (Objects)

I am concerned about the danger of access on such a small but busy road. This an area for people walking, horses and children and they need less vehicles, not more. Thus area has already too many new houses, meaning more traffic. The council should have borne this in mind when they gave planning permission to these developments. My point has been proved when we, in this area have suffered with all the burst pipes, this system cannot take more dwellings.

Mr A Wiseman 1 New Hall Avenue North, Blackpool, FY4 5GY (Objects)

I object to this application on two counts.

1. Additional traffic / Access. Stockydale Road is a narrow road with a blind bend and existing parking congestion. Even a modest increase to the traffic flow would create a noticeable problem. The proposals to further narrow the road to create pavements is nonsensical. Add to that the building site traffic required for construction and it sounds like a disaster area. The only logical access would be from Midgeland Road.

2. Character of the area. As someone who has recently had planning permission turned down on my own property (which is in close proximity) for an extremely modest extension due to the fact that it would make my property "conspicuous in this rural setting". If we are working to the same rules then this application has to be refused also. (Although given the overall number of sizeable housing developments in this area I doubt this will remain a rural setting for much longer.) Removing / reducing hedgerows and turning greenfield site into housing certainly is not my idea of looking after the Moss area, especially when there is a perfectly acceptable brownfield site right next door to this with proper access arrangements.

Ms Lorraine Gregson 19 Stockydale Road, Blackpool, FY4 5HW (Objects)

Road too narrow to support additional vehicle access.

Mr Chris Guerin 3 Ecclesgate Road, Blackpool, FY4 5DW (Objects)

I would object to the proposed changes within this application. The initial plan to create access through Midgeland Road was acceptable and should not be amended because Stockydale Road is regularly used by the equestrian community and narrowing the road and increasing any traffic will cause unnecessary risks for horses and riders.

Mrs D Threlfall 22 Stockydale Road, Blackpool, FY4 5HW (Objects)

There is just simply too many heavy goods vehicles and plant machinery in and around this immediate area including other construction sites and this is for at least the next 12 months,

The Midgeland Road North bound Closure has already forced part of Midgeland Road and Moss House Road, and all of Lime Chase, New Hall Lane and Stockydale Road residents that need to travel this way to either walk or drive past the proposed entrance. Immediate safety issues are children walking to and from schools.

There is no footpath on this road. This is also an established horse riding and cycling route. Historically, further dwelling applications have been refused on Stockydale Road, so why should this one be approved now? The entrances for these dwellings should stay as Midgeland Road and keep Stockydale Road the way it is.

This part of Marton has already lost a lot of rural surrounding my view is to finish the projects in the immediate area first. This year has already seen major disruption to Stockydale Road and Midgeland Road due to the United Utilities mandatory water pipe project, which we all appreciate, has had to be carried out...

Mrs C Threlfall 31 Stockydale Road, Blackpool, FY4 5HP (Objects)

This year has already seen major disruption to Stockydale Road and Midgeland Road due to the United Utilities mandatory water pipe project, which we all appreciate has had to be carried out... Right now, there is just simply too many heavy goods vehicles and plant machinery in and around this immediate area including other construction sites and this is for at least the next 12 months.

The Midgeland Road North bound Closure has already forced part of Midgeland Road and Moss House Road, and all of Lime Chase, New Hall Lane and Stockydale Road residents that need to travel this way to either walk or drive past the proposed entrance. Immediate safety issues are children walking to and from schools.

There is no footpath on this road. This is also an established horse riding and cycling route. Historically, further dwelling applications have been refused on Stockydale Road, so why should this one be approved now? The entrances for these dwellings should stay as Midgeland Road and keep Stockydale Road the way it is.

This part of Marton has already lost a lot of rural surrounding my view is to finish the projects in the immediate area first. This year has already seen major disruption to Stockydale Road and Midgeland Road due to the United Utilities mandatory water pipe project, which we all appreciate has had to be carried out...

Mrs P Hawkins 14 Dunes Ave, Blackpool, FY4 1PY (Objects)

Once again four five bedroom houses are being built on a narrow lane filling in yet more local green space. These properties will generate at least two cars owing to lack of public transport in the area. The site is close to a blind angled bend in the lane. This presents a serious hazard to the many cyclists, riders and dog walkers who use this lane. It is also too narrow for the many wagons who will be delivering materials to this site. The style of houses proposed as with others under construction are totally inappropriate for this rural area,

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

General and core planning principles in paragraphs 2, 7, 8, 14 and 17;

Design issues in paragraphs 9, 17, 56 and 73;

Housing issues in paragraphs 47, 49 and 55;

Highways issues in paragraphs 34 and 35;

Flooding and environmental issues in paragraphs 94, 99, 103, 109 and 111.

BLACKPOOL LOCAL PLAN PART 1: CORE STRATEGY

The Blackpool Local Plan: Part 1 - Core Strategy was adopted by the Council in January 2016. The policies in the Core Strategy that are most relevant to this application are -

Policy CS1: Strategic Location of Development
Policy CS2: Housing Provision
Policy CS6: Green Infrastructure
Policy CS7: Quality of Design
Policy CS9: Water Management
Policy CS13: Housing Mix, Density and Standards
Policy CS26: Marton Moss
Policy CS27: South Blackpool Transport and Connectivity

SAVED POLICIES: BLACKPOOL LOCAL PLAN 2001-2016

The Blackpool Local Plan was adopted in June 2006. A number of policies in the Blackpool Local Plan (2006) have now been superseded by policies in the Core Strategy (these are listed in Appendix B of the Core Strategy). Other policies in the Blackpool Local Plan are saved until the Local Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies is produced.

The following policies are most relevant to this application:

Policy LQ1: Lifting the Quality of Design
Policy LQ2: Site Context
Policy LQ3: Layout of Streets and Spaces
Policy LQ4: Building Design
Policy LQ5: Public Realm Design
Policy LQ6: Landscape Design and Biodiversity
Policy HN4: Windfall Sites
Policy BH3: Residential and Visitor Amenity
Policy BH4: Public Health and Safety
Policy BH10: Open Space in New Housing Developments
Policy NE6: Protected Species
Policy NE7: Sites and Features of Landscape, Nature Conservation and Environmental Value
Policy AS1: General Development Requirements

ASSESSMENT

Principle - the principle of developing the land for housing has been established through the outline planning permission granted in 2013. That permission envisaged six detached houses occupying the site frontage to Stockydale Road but with no direct pedestrian or vehicular access to Stockydale Road. This number was reduced to five as part of the application for the approval of reserved matters in 2016. So in terms of the loss of this open gap between existing development on Stockydale Road this has been previously approved and hence is not an issue in this case. What was not approved previously was the removal of

the existing hedgerow and the creation of a vehicular access onto Stockydale Road. These issues were part of application 08/1181 which envisaged six detached houses fronting Stockydale Road with individual access points and no on site turning facilities. One of the reasons for the refusal of this application was -

The proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety by virtue of the inadequate access to Midgeland Road and the inability of Stockydale Road to accommodate additional traffic generation by virtue of its width, alignment and lack of pavements. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policy AS1 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016.

The application seeks to address this reason for refusal by -

- proposing fewer dwellings - four compared with six
- providing one point of access
- providing on site turning facilities to allow vehicles to enter and leave the development in forward gear
- providing space for a bin lorry or delivery vehicle to pull clear of the road
- widening the carriageway along the site frontage
- the provision of a pavement along the site frontage
- the provision of an additional section of pavement on the eastern side of Stockydale Road
- the planting of a new hedgerow behind the visibility splay

Whilst it is acknowledged that the development would increase traffic on Stockydale Road the reduction in the number of dwellings and other matters detailed above are material changes to the previously refused proposal to access properties off Stockydale Road and on balance are considered acceptable in this case.

Design - the properties would be designed to appear double fronted but the main elevation would face Stockydale Road. There is a mixture of house styles on Stockydale Road and building lines. The proposed houses although having a larger footprint than others in the locality would not look out of place as they would be set back from the road and the materials would match the range of materials in the area. The replacement hedgerow and landscaping to the frontage of the site would help to integrate the site into the streetscape and would hide car parking from view. Each property would have a garage capable of accommodating two cars and the driveways could accommodate three cars. This should mean that there would be unlikely to be on street car parking on Stockydale Road which would be of benefit from a visual and highway safety perspective. As the site has permission for housing paragraph 55 of the NPPF and Policy CS26 are not relevant in this case.

Amenity - Given the proposed siting and orientation of the dwellings it is not considered that they would adversely affect the amenities of surrounding residents and the length of the back gardens means that they would not prejudice the development of the land to the west

Highway Safety - It is acknowledged that Stockydale Road is a narrow lane with only short sections of pavement and it has awkward bends to the south and north of the application site. The road is also deemed unsuitable for heavy vehicles. Members will be aware of the

strength of local feeling regarding the road and the issues regarding rat runs and temporary closure of other roads. Members have previously resisted six properties fronting Stockydale Road with individual access points and no on site turning facilities. This proposal offers a number of elements to seek to overcome those concerns:

- proposing fewer dwellings - four compared with six
- providing one point of access
- providing on site turning facilities to allow vehicles to enter and leave the development in forward gear
- providing space for a bin lorry or delivery vehicle to pull clear of the road
- widening the carriageway along the site frontage
- the provision of a pavement along the site frontage
- the provision of an additional section of pavement on the eastern side of Stockydale Road
- the planting of a new hedgerow behind the visibility splay

Whilst it is recognised that the proposed development would generate additional traffic on Stockydale Road the benefits outlined above are material changes compared to the previous refusal and on balance outweigh the previous concerns.

Parking and Servicing Arrangements - each property would have space for five cars to park - two in a garage and three on the drive. It is possible to condition that the garages remain available for that purpose. The standards require three spaces for houses with four or more bedrooms. Whilst this could be considered to be an over provision it does offer the potential to reduce on street car parking which is a benefit in this instance. Parking would be concealed by the hedgerow and landscaping on the site frontage. The site access would allow for a bin lorry or delivery vehicle to reverse clear of the highway to allow for loading and unloading without impeding access to/egress from the site by private cars. Bin storage areas would be provided either side of the site access.

Other Issues - On a site of this size it is not considered that a mix of house types and sizes is required. The site would provide four large houses which would help to diversify the housing stock. The applicant has attempted to demonstrate how the remainder of the site could be developed and whilst it would deliver a lesser number - 17 compared to 22 this is not considered material in this case. United Utilities has no objection to the drainage proposals for the site. The hedgerow and trees would need to be removed outside the bird breeding season (March -August). The remainder of the site has little ecological value.

CONCLUSION

The principle of developing the site for housing was established through outline planning permission reference 12/0896 albeit with access from Midgeland Road. Members have previously refused six houses fronting Stockydale Road with individual access points and no turning facilities (vehicles would have had to reverse onto Stockydale Road and delivery vehicles/bin lorries alight in Stockydale Road to load/unload). This proposal is for a less intensive development - four houses with one point of access, on site turning, room for delivery and bin lorries to alight clear of Stockydale Road, a widening of the road and a

pavement along the site frontage and part of the eastern side of Stockydale Road. These are seen as benefits of the proposal relative to the previous refusal. Whilst the character of the lane would be temporarily affected by the removal of the hedgerow a replacement hedgerow would be planted either side of the access and clear of the visibility splay to help integrate the development into its setting. On balance the application is recommended for approval.

LEGAL AGREEMENT AND/OR DEVELOPER FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTION

In the absence of on-site open space the application would attract a sum of 4 x £1,376 (£5,504) which would be secured by a condition.

HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

Under Article eight and Article one of the first protocol to the Convention on Human Rights, a person is entitled to the right to respect for private and family life, and the peaceful enjoyment of his/her property. However, these rights are qualified in that they must be set against the general interest and the protection of the rights and freedoms of others. It is not considered that the application raises any human rights issues.

CRIME AND DISORDER ACT 1998

The contents of this report have been considered in the context of the Council's general duty, in all its functions, to have regard to community safety issues as required by section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Planning Application File(s) 17/0301 which can be accessed via the link below:

<http://idoxpa.blackpool.gov.uk/online-applications/search.do?action=simple>

Recommended Decision: Grant Permission

Conditions and Reasons

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2. The development shall be carried out, except where modified by the conditions attached to this permission, in accordance with the planning application received

by the Local Planning Authority including the following plans:

Location Plan stamped as received by the Council on 25th April 2017

Drawings numbered 1701/02/01A, 1701/02/02, 1701/02/03, 1701/02/04

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and so the Local Planning Authority can be satisfied as to the details of the permission.

3. Details of materials to be used on the external elevations shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the development being commenced.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the locality, in accordance with Policy LQ4 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016 and Policy CS7 of the Blackpool Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy 2012-2027.

4. Details of the surfacing materials to be used for the access road and drives of the properties shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the locality, in accordance with Policy LQ1 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016 and Policy CS7 of the Blackpool Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy 2012-2027.

5. a) No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscaping works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include any proposed changes to existing ground levels, means of enclosure and boundary treatment, areas of soft landscaping, hard surfaced areas and materials, planting plans specifications and schedules (including plant size, species and number/ densities), existing landscaping to be retained, and shall show how account has been taken of any underground services.

b) The landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details within the first planting season following completion of the development hereby approved or in accordance with a programme agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority (whichever is sooner.)

c) Any trees or shrubs planted in accordance with this condition which are removed, uprooted, destroyed, die, or become severely damaged or seriously diseased within 5 years of planting shall be replaced within the next planting season by trees or shrubs of similar size and species to those originally required to be planted, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any

variation.

Reason. To ensure the site is satisfactorily landscaped in the interests of visual amenity and to ensure there are adequate areas of soft landscaping to act as a soakaway during times of heavy rainfall with regards to Policy LQ6 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016 and Policy CS7 of the Blackpool Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy 2012-2027.

6. The development authorised by this permission shall not begin until the Local Planning Authority has approved a scheme to secure the provision of or improvements to off-site open space together with a mechanism for delivery, in accordance with Policy BH10 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2011-2016 and Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 11 "Open Space Provision for New Residential Development"(SPG11).

Reason: To ensure sufficient provision of or to provide sufficient improvements to open space to serve the dwellings in accordance with Policy BH10 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2011-2016 and Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 11 "Open Space Provision for New Residential Development"(SPG11).

NOTE – The development is of a scale to warrant a contribution of £5,504 towards the provision of or improvement to off-site open space and management of the open space provision, in accordance with Policy BH10 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016 and SPG 11. The Applicant(s) should contact the Council to arrange payment of the contribution.

7. Prior to the development hereby approved being first brought into use the refuse storage provision shown on the approved plans shall be provided and shall thereafter be retained.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the locality and the residential amenity of occupants and neighbours, in accordance with Policies LQ1 and BH3 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016 and Policy CS7 of the Blackpool Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy 2012-2027.

8. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order) the garage shall not be used for any purpose which would preclude its use for the parking of a motor car.

Reason: In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the retention of parking space within the site is of importance in safeguarding the appearance of the locality and highway safety, in accordance with Policies AS1 and LQ1 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016 and Policy CS7 of the Blackpool Local Plan Part 1:

Core Strategy 2012-2027.

9. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order) no change of use from Use Class C3 (the subject of this permission) to Use Class C4 shall take place without the written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the living conditions of the occupants of nearby residential premises and to prevent the further establishment of Houses in Multiple Occupation which would further increase the stock of poor quality accommodation in the town and further undermine the aim of creating balanced and healthy communities, in accordance with Policies BH3 and HN5 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016 and Policies CS7, CS12 and CS13 of the Blackpool Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy 2012-2027.

10. Details of the slab levels of the proposed dwellings and the levels of the service road and pavements shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority within 6 months of the date of this approval. The development shall then be constructed in accordance with the approved levels.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the locality and the residential amenity of occupants and neighbours, in accordance with Policies LQ1 and BH3 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016 and Policy CS7 of the Blackpool Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy 2012-2027.

11. Each house shall be provided with a 200 litre water butt which shall collect surface water from the main roof

Reason: In order to minimise flood risk from surface water run off both on and off site in accordance with Policy CS9 of the Blackpool Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy 2012-2027.

12. Prior to the occupation of any part of the development, a lighting strategy to include details of the appearance of any fixtures, illuminance levels and light spillage shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed lighting strategy shall be implemented in full before any property first occupied.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the locality, the safety and security of local residents, the biodiversity of the site and highway safety in accordance with Policies LQ1, LQ3, LQ6, BH3 and AS1 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016 and Policy CS7 of the Blackpool Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy 2012-2027.

13. The replacement hedgerow on the site frontage shall be retained at all times. Any part of the hedgerow which is removed, uprooted, destroyed, which dies, or becomes severely damaged or seriously diseased within 5 years of planting shall be replaced within the next planting season by hedgerow of similar size and species to those originally required to be planted, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason. To ensure the site is satisfactorily screened in the interests of visual amenity, to ensure it integrates with the urban fringe landscape and to ensure there are adequate areas of soft landscaping to act as a soakaway during times of heavy rainfall with regards to Policy LQ6 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016 and Policy CS7 of the Blackpool Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy 2012-2027.

14. No development shall be commenced until details of the pavement numbered 3. on drawing No. 1701/02/01 A has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of pedestrian and highway safety in accordance with Policy AS1 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016.

15. No house shall be occupied until the site access works, road widening, pavement across the site frontage and pavement 3 (referred to in condition 14) have been constructed in accordance with drawing No. 1701/02/01 A.

Reason: In the interests of pedestrian and highway safety in accordance with Policy AS1 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016.

Advice Notes to Developer

1. Please note this approval relates specifically to the details indicated on the approved plans and documents, and to the requirement to satisfy all conditions of the approval. Any variation from this approval needs to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to works commencing and may require the submission of a revised application. Any works carried out without such written agreement or approval would render the development as unauthorised and liable to legal proceedings.

2. Policy BH10 of the Blackpool Local Plan states that new residential developments will need to provide sufficient open space to meet the needs of its residents in accordance with the Council's approved standards. The policy goes on to say that where it is not possible to provide the full requirement of public open space on site, developers may pay a commuted sum to cover the provision or improvement of public open space off site. Details of the Council's standards and calculated commuted sum rates are set out in Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 11 "Open Space Provision for New Residential Development". In accordance with this document, and given that no public open space can be provided on site, the commuted sum required in respect of this development would be £5,504.
3. The grant of planning permission will require the developer to enter into an appropriate Legal Agreement with Blackpool Borough Council acting as Highway Authority. The Highway Authority may also wish to implement their right to design all works within the highway relating to this proposal. The applicant is advised to contact the Council's Highways Department, Layton Depot, Depot Road, Blackpool, FY3 7HW (Tel 01253 477477) in the first instance to ascertain the details of such an agreement and the information provided.
4. Please note that any address changes or new addresses needed as a result of this development must be agreed by the Council. Please contact Council's Highways Department, Layton Depot, Depot Road, Blackpool, FY3 7HW (Tel 01253 477477).