

Minutes of Planning Committee

Meeting date Monday, 29 November 2021

Committee members present: Councillors Caleb Tomlinson (Chair), Malcolm Donoghue (Vice-Chair), Will Adams, Damian Bretherton, James Flannery, Mary Green, Harry Hancock, Jon Hesketh, Clare Hunter, Chris Lomax, Peter Mullineaux, Phil Smith and Gareth Watson

Officers present: Jonathan Noad (Director of Planning and Development), Steven Brown (Head of Development Management), Dave Whelan (Shared Services Lead - Legal & Deputy Monitoring Officer), Chris Sowerby (Development Planning Team Leader), Janice Crook (Planning Officer) and Charlotte Lynch (Democratic and Member Services Officer)

Other attendees: Councillors Aniela Bylinski Gelder, Bill Evans, Paul Foster, Michael Green, Keith Martin, Colin Sharples, Margaret Smith (attended virtually), Mick Titherington, Matthew Trafford, Karen Walton and Carol Wooldridge (attended virtually)

Public: 11

73 Welcome and Introduction

The Chair, Councillor Caleb Tomlinson, welcomed members of the public to the meeting, introduced the committee and explained the varied procedure for debate given that the applications on the agenda related to a major site for development as identified in the 2015 South Ribble Local Plan.

The Chair also welcomed Councillor Clare Hunter who was attending her first meeting of the Planning Committee following her recent appointment.

74 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Caroline Moon and Barrie Yates.

Councillors Damian Bretherton and Peter Mullineaux attended as substitutes.

75 Declarations of Interest

There were none.

76 07/2021/00886/ORM and 07/2021/00887/ORM - Pickering's Farm Site, Flag Lane, Penwortham

Speakers: 6 objectors, Councillors Paul Foster; Karen Walton; Carol Wooldridge; Keith Martin; Matthew Trafford; and Michael Green, Mr Mark Philips (Homes England), Mr Gary Halman (Avison Young) and Mr Mike Axon (Vectos)

Address: Pickering's Farm site
Flag Lane
Penwortham
Lancashire
PR1 9TP

Applicant: Adam Riding and Mark Philips

Agent: Miss Emma Williams
Avison Young
Norfolk House
7 Norfolk Street
Manchester
M2 1DW

Development: Application A - Outline planning application with all matters reserved except for the principal means of access for a residential-led mixed-use development of up to 920 dwellings (Use Classes C3 and C2), a local centre including retail, employment and community uses (Use Classes E and Sui Generis), a two form entry primary school (Use Class F), green infrastructure, and associated infrastructure following the demolition of certain existing buildings

Application B - Outline planning application with all matters reserved except for the principal means of access for a residential development of up to 180 dwellings (Use Classes C3 and C2), green infrastructure and associated infrastructure

The officer recommendation was proposed by Councillor James Flannery, seconded by Councillor Will Adams, and subsequently

Resolved: (unanimously)

That

1. the illustrative masterplan be refused;
2. application A (Ref: 07/2021/00886/ORM) be refused; and
3. application B (Ref: 07/2021/00887/ORM) be refused

for the following reasons:

1. It has not been demonstrated that the modelling methodology applied within the submitted Transport Assessment is acceptable. As such it has not been

demonstrated that the proposed development would not have a severe adverse impact on the local highway network. The proposal is therefore contrary to the requirements of para. 111 of the NPPF, Policy 17 of the Core Strategy and Policy G17 of the South Ribble Local Plan.

2. It has not been demonstrated that the scoping and composition of technical supporting evidence of the submitted Transport Assessment is acceptable. As such it has not been demonstrated that the proposed development would not have a severe adverse impact on the local highway network. The proposal is therefore contrary to the requirements of para. 111 of the NPPF, Policy 17 of the Core Strategy and Policy G17 of the South Ribble Local Plan.
3. The proposed improvements to the Bee Lane bridge are not considered to be sufficient for the additional traffic, as well as increased number of pedestrians and cyclists, resulting from the development prejudicing highway safety and pedestrian safety. The proposal is therefore contrary to the requirements of para. 111 of the NPPF, Policy 17 of the Core Strategy and Policy G17 of the South Ribble Local Plan.
4. The application fails to provide adequate certainty that the section of the Cross Borough Link Road within the site, together with the necessary physical upgrading works to the Bee Lane bridge, will be delivered. The proposal is therefore contrary to the requirements of Policy A2 of the South Ribble Local Plan.
5. Policy C1 of the South Ribble Local Plan requires an agreed masterplan and design code for the comprehensive development of the site. The masterplan has not been formally agreed by South Ribble Council and the version submitted with the two applications does not meet the policy requirements.
6. Policy C1 of the South Ribble Local Plan requires the submission of a phasing and infrastructure delivery schedule and an agreed programme of implementation. The submitted documentation provides insufficient detail on how the site will be delivered and no detailed phasing plan has been submitted and no programme of implementation has been agreed. Therefore, the scheme is contrary to Policy C1.
7. Policy A2 of the South Ribble Local Plan seeks to ensure delivery of the Cross Borough Link Road through the major development site at Pickering's Farm. The two applications together with the Masterplan do not provide a firm commitment for the delivery of this key piece of infrastructure necessary to support the scale of development proposed. The scheme is therefore contrary to Policy A2.
8. Inadequate information has been provided to address air quality impacts and insufficient mitigation has been identified to make the development acceptable. The proposal is therefore contrary to Paragraphs 185 and 186 of the NPPF and Policy 30 of the Core Strategy.
9. The proposals will generate additional demand for sporting provision, and it is not clear how this would be addressed in the current planning applications. Nor is it clear how the concept of active design would be achieved in the scheme to deliver an active, healthy community and is therefore contrary to

Policies G10 and G11 in the South Ribble Local Plan and Paragraph 100 of the NPPF.

10. Due to the lack of an agreed Masterplan and commitment to providing the cross borough link road, the proposals do not follow the 'proper planning approach' or represent good planning for the area as required by the NPPF paragraphs 126 and 132.

11. No viability evidence has been submitted to enable an assessment of whether necessary infrastructure can be provided to support this important housing land allocation. As such the proposals are contrary to Policies A1 and C1 in the South Ribble Local Plan.

Chair

Date