

2.1 **Conditions & Informatives**

Full Application

1. Time Limit (3 years).
2. Approved plans.
3. Archaeological investigation, recording and analysis prior to the commencement of development (Full permission area).
4. Final sustainable drainage scheme prior to the commencement of development.
5. Construction phase surface water management plan.
6. Operation and maintenance plan, and verification report of constructed sustainable drainage system prior to the occupation/first use of the development.
7. Details of the protection of water mains within the site boundary prior to the commencement of development.
8. Landscaping scheme and ecology mitigation prior to any above ground works.
9. No works to trees or shrubs during bird nesting season.
10. Reasonable avoidance measures for hedgehogs to be implemented.

Outline Application

11. Time limit to submit reserved matters (10 years)
12. Details of appearance, landscaping, layout, access and scale.
13. Approved plans.
14. Reserved Matters in accordance with the mitigation measures set out within Environmental Statement.
15. Design Code to be submitted to and approved in writing prior to the first reserved matters application.
16. Reserved matters in accordance with Design and Access Statement and Design Codes for each phase of development.
17. The total Class E floorspace associated with the application shall not exceed 2000 square metres.
18. Phasing plan prior to the commencement of development.
19. Details of materials to be submitted prior to any above ground works.
20. Details of materials of all public realm and hardstanding prior to any above ground works.
21. Construction and Environmental Management Plan to be submitted prior to the commencement of development.
22. Noise study, in accordance with the Environmental Statement, to be submitted with reserved matters application.
23. Land contamination site intrusive investigation to be submitted with reserved matters application.
24. Travel Plan Action Plan to be submitted prior to the first occupation of the residential development for each phase of development to form part of site wider Full Travel Plan.
25. Details of electric vehicle charging points prior to any above grounds works.
26. Details of cycle storage to be submitted prior to above grounds works for each dwelling
27. Details of cycle storage for the local centre to be submitted with reserved matters application.
28. Archaeological investigation, recording and analysis prior to the commencement of development (outline permission area).
29. Landscape and Environmental Management Plan to be submitted with reserved matters application.

30. Final sustainable drainage scheme prior to the commencement of development for each phase of development.
31. Drainage strategy for foul and surface water to be submitted with reserved matters application.
32. Surface water drainage system details to be submitted with reserved matters application for each phase of development.
33. Surface water drainage system implementation prior to occupation.
34. Foul drainage scheme to be submitted with reserved matters application.
35. Foul drainage scheme implementation prior to occupation.
36. Construction phase surface water management plan.
37. Operation and maintenance plan, and verification report of constructed sustainable drainage system prior to the occupation/first use of the development.
38. Construction method statement detailing measures to protect United Utilities assets to be submitted with reserved matters application.
39. Ecology construction and environmental management plan to be submitted with reserved matters application.
40. Great Crested Newt surveys for all ponds including a full survey for pond 9 as identified in the Great Crested Newt Impact Assessment UES to be submitted at with reserved matters application.
41. Updated bat surveys to be submitted with reserved matters application.
42. Updated badger, water vole and otter surveys to be provided with reserved matters application.
43. Design and layout of sports provision to be submitted with reserved matters application.
44. Landscaping scheme including public open space, retention and mitigation measures to be submitted with reserved matters application.
45. Scheme of replacement tree planting to be submitted with reserved matters application.
46. Details of tree and ground protection measures to be submitted prior to the commencement of development for each phase of development.
47. No works to trees and shrubs during bird nesting season.
48. Invasive species method statement to be submitted prior to commencement of development.
49. Waste Management Plan to be submitted with reserved matters application.
50. Public Transport Strategy to be submitted prior to first occupation of each phase.
51. Construction Traffic Management Plan to be submitted prior to each phase of development
52. Wider Traffic Management Plan to be submitted with reserved matters application.
53. Pedestrian link to be provided between development areas and the underpasses of the Preston Western Distributor Road.
54. Employment and Skills Plan to be submitted with reserved matters application.
55. Energy efficiency standards for each dwelling to be submitted prior to the commencement of development.
56. Energy efficiency standards for non-residential development in accordance with BREEAM 'Very Good' to be submitted prior to the commencement of development.
57. Reserved matters application shall include the agreed quantum of Public Open Space.
58. Reserved matters application to include provision of countryside furniture, pathway marking and interpretative panels within the site and links to the Public Rights of Way network;

59. Homeowners packs in relation to ecology and recreation to be provided for each residential dwelling.
60. A Travel Plan for each phase and associated coordinator being in place from the point of the occupation of the first dwelling for a period of not less than five years.
61. A surface water drainage strategy to demonstrate how surface water can be dealt on site to avoid surface waters passing onto the M55 motorway.
62. Reserved matters submission to be in accordance with surface water drainage strategy.
63. No connection between the site drainage and the M55 motorway drainage system;
64. Construction plan and method statement for earthworks and drainage alongside M55 motorway.
65. Details of boundary fencing along northern boundary of site and M55 motorway.
66. Affordable housing scheme for each phase of development.

Informatives

1. CIL.
2. Archaeology.
3. Waste Management guidance.
4. Lead Local Flood Authority – Land Drainage Consent required before works commence.
5. United Utilities property, assets, infrastructure and easements.
6. Electricity North West infrastructure.
7. Lancashire Constabulary security standards.
8. Great Crested Newt – Natural England Licence.

3 Information

3.1 Location

The application site comprises of 45.1 hectares in area of land, separated into three parcels of primarily agricultural farmland. The three parcels of land are separated by Lea Lane and Rosemary Lane, which run in a north-south direction and Blackleach Lane, which heads west towards the Fylde Borough district area.

The smallest parcel is bound to the north by a farm track (Public Right of Way), to the east by Rosemary Lane, to the south by Blackleach Lane and to the west by open farmland.

The largest parcel is bound to the west by Rosemary Lane, part of the west boundary curves around the Bartle Hall Country Hotel, to the south the largest parcel is bound by Bartle Lane (on the south side is the North West Preston Strategic Location) and to the east open farmland. The northern boundary of the largest parcel is bound by a farm track and hedgerows separating agricultural fields. Beyond is the M55 Motorway and the Preston Western Distributor Road (PWDR), currently under construction, would run from the motorway through this parcel south towards Blackpool Road.

The remaining parcel lies to the south of Blackleach Lane, which forms its northern boundary, and is bound by Lea Lane to the east, the boundary of Ivy Farm to the south and open farmland to the west.

The application site also contains the Bartle Wetlands Biological Heritage Site (BHS), two

areas of trees covered by Tree Preservation Order TPO/1979/0004, which comprise an area of trees surrounding Bartle Hall and trees on the western side of Lea Lane, between Blackleach Lane and the Saddle Inn Public House. There are also two Public Rights of Way which cross the site (Footpath no.95 which leads from the north of Bartle Hall, east towards Sandy Lane, and Footpath no.96, which runs across the northern boundary of the application site between Rosemary Lane and Blackleach Lane. In addition, the consultation area of the Transpennine Ethylene Gas Pipeline crosses the north part of the application site.

The application is identified as 'Open Countryside' on the Policies Map of the Adopted Preston Local Plan, together with the defined route of the PWDR and the Bartle Wetlands BHS. Land to the south of Bartle Lane is allocated as the North West Preston Strategic Location.

3.2 **Proposal**

This hybrid application seeks full and outline planning permissions for the proposed development of land. The full application seeks detailed planning permission for a new roundabout junction on the alignment of the PWDR with two spur road accesses, together with associated highway infrastructure works and landscaping.

The proposed roundabout would have a 46m diameter and would have three 4m wide lanes circulating the roundabout. There is a proposed 2m wide verge around the roundabout and a proposed 3m wide footway/cycleway. The roundabout would provide direct access to the applicant's existing land holdings surrounding the PWDR. It is proposed that the eastern and western arms of the roundabout would provide access to the proposed residential development.

The outline application seeks permission for two options of predominantly residential development. Option 1 comprises up to 1,100 dwellings. Option 2 would comprise a 5% reduction in the number of residential properties and would include up to 3.1ha of land for a primary school and small scale local facilities. Both options would also include access and circulation roads, cycle routes, pedestrian routes, public open space, green space, tree planting, landscaping and associated infrastructure and works.

The proposed development subject to the outline application, would be separated into four zones of development, which would comprise the following:

Zone A

Set to the east of the PWDR and north of Bartle Lane, which would include up to 278no. dwellings with a mixture of 1-2 bedroom apartments and 2-5 bedroom dwellings. The density of development would be up to 34.7 dwellings per hectare (dph).

Zone B

Set to the west of the PWDR, north of Bartle Hall and east of Rosemary Lane, which would include up to 389no. dwellings with a mixture of 1-2 bedroom apartments and 2-5 bedroom dwellings. The density of development would be up to 33.4dph.

Zone C

Set to the west of Lea Lane and north of Blackleach Lane, which would include up to 178 no. dwellings with a mixture of 2 bedroom apartments and 2-5 bedroom dwellings. The

density of development would be up to 33.4dph.

Zone D

Set to the south of Blackleach Lane and west of Lea Lane, abutting the administrative boundary of Fylde Borough Council, which would include 233no. dwellings with a mixture of 2-5 bedroom dwellings. The density of development would be up to 34.0dph.

Under the Option 2 proposal, the number of residential units would reduce to up to 1,050 properties with the inclusion of land for a primary school and local facilities, which would be located within Zone B.

The applicant intends to deliver option 2, however if a reassessment of education needs, set out in the planning obligation, changes at a later date, the land for the primary school would be developed for housing under option 1 and a clause in the planning obligation would provide for the redistribution of contributions towards affordable housing and education (school places) and transport infrastructure.

3.3 **Relevant planning history**

06/2020/0566 - Request for a screening and scoping opinion Pursuant to Regulation 6 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England) Regulations 2017 for a proposed development comprising the construction of a roundabout on the Preston Western Distribution Road and proposed residential development of up to 1,100 dwellings – Environmental Impact Assessment Required – July 2020.

Lancashire County Council

LCC/2016/0046 - Development of new highways including Preston Western Distributor, Cottam Link Road and East West Link Road. The development includes and new motorway junction to the M55 together with temporary soil storage and contractor areas, cycle track alongside all highways, water attenuation ponds, diversion/stopping up of public rights of way, landscaping and ecology mitigation areas, construction of two bridges, two viaducts, two underpasses, a cattle creep and diversion of the Hodder Aqueduct – Approved November 2018.

3.4 **Planning Policy Framework**

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that if regard is to be had to the Development Plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the Planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The Development plan comprises:

Central Lancashire Core Strategy

Policy 1 - Locating growth

Policy 2 - Infrastructure

Policy 3 - Travel

Policy 4 - Housing delivery

Policy 5 - Housing density

Policy 7 - Affordable and special needs housing

Policy 11 - Retail and Town Centre Uses and Business Based Tourism

Policy 13 - Rural economy

Policy 14 - Education

Policy 16 - Heritage assets
Policy 17 - Design of new buildings
Policy 18 - Green infrastructure
Policy 21 - Landscape character areas
Policy 22 - Biodiversity and geodiversity
Policy 24 - Sports and recreation
Policy 25 - Community facilities
Policy 26 - Crime and community safety
Policy 27 - Sustainable resources and new developments
Policy 29 - Water management
Policy 30 - Air quality
Policy 31 - Agricultural land

Preston Local Plan 2012-26 (Site Allocations and Development Management Policies)

Policy IN1 - Western Distributor
Policy HS1 - Allocation of housing sites
Policy MD2 – North West Preston
Policy HS3 - Green infrastructure in new housing developments
Policy ST1 - Parking standards
Policy ST2 - General transport considerations
Policy EP4 – Local Centres
Policy EN1 - Development in the open countryside
Policy EN2 - Protection and enhancement of green infrastructure
Policy EN3 - Future provision of green infrastructure
Policy EN7 - Land quality
Policy EN8 - Development and heritage assets
Policy EN9 - Design of new development
Policy EN10 - Biodiversity and nature conservation
Policy EN11 - Species protection

Other Material Considerations:

Central Lancashire Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)

Affordable Housing
Design Guide
Open Space and Playing Pitch
North West Preston Masterplan

National Planning Policy Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)
National Planning Policy for Waste
National Design Guide

Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990
The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended)
Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended)
The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended)
Abandonment of Animals Act 1960

Habitats Directive 1992
Hedgerows Regulations 1997
Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006
Protection of Animals Act 1911
The Protection of Badgers Act 1992
Wild Mammals Protection Act 1996

3.5 **Consultation responses**

Publicity – 15no objections have been received, including 1no letter signed by 8no households, together with comments from a Planning Consultancy, which can be summarised as follows:

- Environmental impact upon the area;
- Council's should encourage new development on brownfield sites, rather than on untouched land;
- Loss of open countryside, which will not be replaced, which is contrary to Policy EN1;
- Impact upon Bartle Hall and surrounding gardens and woodlands;
- Potential economic impact upon Bartle Hall;
- There is no need for additional properties as existing newly built properties remain unoccupied;
- The current school infrastructure is not sufficient to accommodate the number of homes proposed;
- The road network into Preston from the proposed development is not sufficient to handle extra cars that would result from the development;
- Adding a new junction to the Preston Western Distributor would not ease congestion, but cause congestion to the M55;
- Increased vehicle trips would generate additional carbon emissions;
- The proposed crossing on the PWDR is inappropriate and unsafe;
- Increased localised flooding from new development, such as Hoyles Lane;
- Zone D currently experiences flooding each year;
- The current waste water drainage will not support the development, which could cause huge disruption;
- Impact upon wildlife;
- Light pollution to surrounding rural houses;
- There are not enough local facilities to support the development;
- Impact upon existing services, such as the Household Recycling Centre on Tom Benson Way and bus services;
- The plans do not align with North West Preston Masterplan and would exceed what has previously been agreed;
- Due to the pending recession, this development of additional houses should be considered to be unviable;
- Impact upon existing neighbouring properties;
- Impact upon listed buildings;
- Increased traffic in local area, which are country lanes with no pavements or lighting;
- The proposed development of 1000+ properties would represent an overdevelopment of the site;
- Overbearing, out-of-scale development which is out of character and appearance

- compared to existing development in the vicinity;
- Visual impact that does not match the rural setting of the area;
- Impact upon trees subject Tree Preservation Orders;
- There is no requirement for a roundabout as it was not included with the original agreed plans;
- Option 2 would provide 0.2ha of small scale facilities (main town uses commercial floorspace) which fails to address the sequential test;
- Request any commercial floorspace permitted is restricted to Class E retail and leisure;
- Potential damage to property through vibrations from increased passing traffic

A number of additional comments have been made, which cannot be considered as material planning considerations, which include:

- De-valuation of property values;
- Loss of views from neighbouring properties;
- Concerns that the previous public consultation (by the applicant) was held online;
- Disagree with the applicant's response to the public consultation;
- Concerns over septic tanks at existing neighbouring properties;
- Existing covenants and legal agreements between landowners;
- Financial benefit to the applicant/landowner.

Woodplumpton Parish Council – Objection. The proposed development is identified as open countryside in the adopted Preston Local Plan and is contrary to policy. Preston can demonstrate a 13.6 years' worth of development land, well in excess of the five year housing land supply and therefore following Government guidance the Development Plan policies which are most important for determining the application are not considered to be out-of-date and can therefore be afforded full weight. The North West Preston Masterplan was developed to provide a comprehensive framework to guide the future development of North West Preston, including infrastructure and services. The Preston Western Distributor Road (PWDR) was considered to be an essential route to support the strategic location. As construction works have already commenced on the PWDR, it would be a knee-jerk reaction to propose a new roundabout at such a late stage in the planning process and would bring into question the need for the planning process. The proposed pedestrian crossing on the PWDR for primary school children would be unsafe.

In addition, there has been no debate, analysis or identification of the key local issues at a public hearing in accordance with the provisions of the Development Plan and the Framework. Also no debate has taken place regarding the need for yet more housing in this area and given the community facilities in North West Preston are yet to be delivered, there is no evidence to suggest the location is sustainable. The Parish Council recommend the application be refused on the following reason for refusal:

'The application site is located in the open countryside as shown on the policies map of the Preston Local Plan 2012-26 (Site Allocations and Development Management Policies). The proposed development would be contrary to the hierarchy of locations for focussing growth and investment at urban, brownfield and allocated sites, within key service centres and other defined areas. It fails to accord with the management of growth and investment set out in Policy 1 of the Central Lancashire Core Strategy and consequently it would lead to the unplanned expansion of a rural area. Furthermore, the proposed development is not

the type of development deemed permissible in the open countryside under Policy EN1 of the Preston Local Plan 2012-26 (Site Allocations and Development Management Policies), hence the loss of open countryside for the development proposed is contrary to that policy. The proposed development is contrary to Policy 1 of the Central Lancashire Core Strategy and Policy EN1 of the Preston Local Plan 2012-26.'

County Archaeology – No objection. The potential significance of below ground archaeological remains is considered to be low, however as the site covers a large area, there may be potential for unknown archaeological sites to be encountered. Therefore recommend a condition for a programme of archaeological investigation, recording and analysis to be submitted prior to construction works.

County Education – Based on the assumption that all proposed dwellings will be 4 bedroom dwellings, the proposed development would require an education contribution towards both primary and secondary school places. In addition to the primary school contribution, the proposed development will be required to provide an area of land within the application site as part of the proposals for a two form entry primary school requiring an area of 20,040m². A maximum total claim based on 4 bedroom dwellings would generate a need for 418 primary school places to be provided by a financial contribution of £8,315,173.68 and a need for 110 secondary school places to be provided by a financial contribution of £3,805,188.75, which could increase to £3,989,886.45 should the school places be needed at the proposed North West Preston secondary school site. Department for Education Guidance also states that a nursery would also be required on site.

County Highways – The proposed roundabout junction to the PWDR is acceptable. However, the outline proposals do not provide evidence of safe and suitable access for all road users to the wider site, and do not provide priority to pedestrian and cycle movements, or facilitate high quality public transport.

Electricity North West (ENW) – No objection in principle. The proposed development could impact upon ENW infrastructure, which the developer should give early consideration to in the project design.

Environmental Health – No objection in principle. Recommend noise studies are submitted for each phase the reserved matters submission for both proposed residential and small scale local facilities. Conditions are also recommended for site intrusive investigation and remediation if contamination is encountered; and air quality mitigation measures comprising cycle and pedestrian friendly roads, cycle storage, electric vehicle charging points and a Travel Plan.

Environment Agency – No objection. The proposal is a major greenfield development that has the potential to significantly impact on a range of habitats and the proposal should provide Biodiversity Net Gain. Recommend opportunities to ensure biodiversity enhancements in and around the development are identified and incorporated into the design of the development. Recommend a Landscape and Environmental Management Plan is submitted at reserved matters stage.

Fylde Borough Council – Objection. The scheme is not considered to represent a sustainable form of development due to the almost exclusive concentration on housing development in a location that does not have any meaningful existing services or

sustainable transport links to support that development. This would be exacerbated by Option 1, which would not include any supporting services and result in a reliance on private car transport. It is considered that it will create a significant visual harm to the rural landscape in the area of Fylde around the application site, in particular Zone D and that there is a real potential for a development of this scale and location to undermine the sustainable spatial development strategy of the Fylde Local Plan to 2032.

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (GMEU) – No objection in principle, subject to conditions regarding the submission of an ecology construction and environmental management plan and updated ecology surveys being attached to the outline proposal and conditions restricting works within the bird nesting season being attached to both the full and outline proposals should permission be granted.

Highways England – No objection, subject to conditions relating to: Travel Plan and associated coordinator being in place; surface water drainage strategy; reserved matters submission in accordance with surface water drainage strategy; no site drainage connection to the M55 motorway drainage system; Construction plan and method statement for earthworks and drainage alongside M55 motorway; and details boundary fencing along northern boundary of site and M55 motorway.

Lead Local Flood Authority – No objection, subject to conditions regarding sustainable drainage, surface water management, operation and maintenance, and a verification report of constructed sustainable drainage system.

Natural England – No objection, the proposed development could have potential significant effects on the Ribble and Alt Estuaries Special Protection Area (SPA), the Ribble and Estuaries Ramsar Site and Newton Marsh Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). In order to mitigate these adverse effects, conditions are recommended to secure the provision of the agreed quantum of public open space; countryside furniture, pathway marking, interpretative panels and links to public rights of way; and homeowner packs.

Sport England – No objection in principle. Community infrastructure for indoor and outdoor sports facilities will be required to support the increase in population associated with the proposed development. A financial contribution and/or on-site provision should be secured towards the investment in improving or creating sports facilities within the catchment of the application site. A condition is recommended for the overall design and layout of sports facilities to be submitted at reserved matters stage.

SABIC – No observations to make.

United Utilities – No objection in principle. The submitted drainage details are considered to be acceptable in principle, however further detailed drainage proposal would be required at reserved matters stage. There are two Large Diameter Trunk Mains (LDTM) which cross the northern part of the site. The recommended conditions regarding foul and surface water drainage, management and maintenance, development phasing and asset protection are required to ensure the protection of UU property and assets and to ensure that there are no issues further along the development process.

Designing Out Crime Officer – No objection in principle. The proposed scheme should be developed to Secured By Design security standards, including New Homes 2019 design

guide. Recommendations are provided for security measures to be incorporated into the detailed design of the development considered under the outline application.

Parks and Street Scene (Landscape) – No objection in principle. The submitted Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, together with the recommended mitigation and compensation measures are considered to be acceptable. It is recommended that conditions are attached to any permission granted to require detailed landscape information, details of public open space, the retention and mitigation measures for hedgerows, field boundaries, trees, ecology and ponds to be submitted at reserved matters stage.

Parks and Street Scene (Arborist) – No objection in principle. The proposals appear to be reasonably well designed in order to retain the majority of the existing tree stock, although more trees could be incorporated into the overall design of the development. Request six trees identified for felling are retained. Overall, a high volume of trees would remain as part of the proposed development along with mitigation tree planting.

Waste Management – No objection in principle. The submitted swept path analysis satisfactorily demonstrates that Council vehicles could access the development safely. Recommend that for any reserved matters application details of the layout of the development incorporate Waste Management guidance to allow Council vehicles to access residential streets and properties within the development and collection points are provided.

Applicant – Following the appeal decision on land at Cardwell Farm on 9th March 2021, the applicant has provided the following information:

- A consequence of the appeal being allowed is that 151 dwellings will be added to the five year housing land supply for Preston;
- In the absence of a fully up to date Local Plan and a confirmed five year housing land supply, the Council would strongly benefit from a sustainable, planning urban extension scheme such this proposal;
- The proposed development would provide certainty of supply over the roll out period of the development, which is estimated at 10 years;
- High capital costs are associated with the early initial phases of proposed development (in the main due to the delivery of the roundabout) as such the application proposes to deliver a high number of dwellings in the early phase of development, likely to be in the range of 200 plus dwellings, which would make a significant contribution towards the Council's five year housing land supply;
- A marketing exercise would commence straight away following planning permission being secured;
- Given the findings of the appeal decision the tilted balance applies and its effect is that less weight should be given to policies that apply to the application site. The scheme offers the potential to deliver important new transportation infrastructure and utilities/services and a sustainable urban extension to the north west of Preston. These factors represent an important and weighty material consideration in support of the planning application.

3.6 **Analysis**

Principle of Proposal

The application site is defined as open countryside, falling outside but adjacent to the North West Preston Strategic Location (NWPSL) as identified on the Policies Map of the adopted Preston Local Plan 2012-26. Policy 1 of the Core Strategy relates to all types of development and seeks to focus growth and investment on well-located brownfield sites, identified strategic locations and other main urban areas, and other defined places, whilst protecting suburban and rural areas. The hierarchical sequence for locating development puts other places, including smaller villages, substantially built up frontages and Major Developed Sites, at the bottom of the hierarchy.

In such locations development is expected to be small scale, and limited to appropriate infilling, the conversion of buildings and proposals that meet local need, unless there are exceptional needs for a larger scale redevelopment scheme. The application site is located outside of any settlement boundary and is not within a substantially built up frontage nor a Major Developed Site. The proposed development of this site for up to 1100no. dwellings, together with a primary school and local facilities and the proposed new roundabout junction to the PWDR is not considered to be small scale; would not represent an infill development and would not constitute redevelopment, conversion or development that meets a local need. The application site is located within the defined open countryside and the principle of the residential-led development on this site would be contrary to the hierarchy of locations for focussing growth and investment, and is therefore contrary to Core Strategy Policy 1.

Policy EN1 of the Preston Local Plan seeks to protect areas of open countryside from unacceptable development which would harm its open and rural character, and limits development to that which is needed for the purposes of agriculture or forestry, other appropriate rural uses, the re-use or re-habitation of existing buildings or infilling within small groups of buildings within smaller rural settlements. The supporting text to Policy EN1 states that it is important that these areas (of open countryside) are protected from unacceptable development which would harm its open character. The application site is defined as open countryside, and the proposed development is not required for any exceptional purposes set out in Policy EN1, nor is it located within the defined boundaries of a small rural settlement or village, nor does it represent infilling. As such the proposal would not comply with Policy EN1 of the Adopted Preston Local Plan 2012-26.

Policy 31 of the Core Strategy seeks to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a) to achieve the full potential of the soil. Paragraph 170b) of the Framework also states that local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the most versatile agricultural land.

The submitted Agricultural Land Classification and Impact Assessment summarises that the land within the application site comprises of generally medium clay soils and the agricultural land is Grade 3b. Therefore, under the Grade 3b classification, the site is only considered to be of moderate quality and the proposed development would not lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land. The application would not therefore conflict with Core Strategy Policy 31.

Policy 11 of the Core Strategy supports retail and other town centre uses of a scale appropriate to the retail hierarchy and in sustainable locations, provided that the development respects the character of the centre and assists in maintaining its existing retail function, including maintaining, improving and controlling the mix of uses in the existing District and Local Centres and proposed centres at Strategic Sites and Locations, so as to appropriately serve local needs as well as focussing main town centre uses in the defined town centres. A Local Centre, which is defined in Appendix A of the Core Strategy, includes 'a range of small shops of a local nature, serving a small catchment, typically local centres might include, amongst other shops a small supermarket, a newsagent, a sub-post office and a pharmacy. Other facilities could include a hot food takeaway and laundrette.

Policy EP4 of the Local Plan identifies the eight existing Local Centres within Preston, as defined on the Policies Map, with new local centres proposed under Policy MD2 within the NWPSL. The explanatory wording in Paragraph 6.42 emphasises that Local Centres play an important role in Preston's retail hierarchy, as well as acting as social centres and places of employment, providing the function of convenience shopping, a range of services and community facilities. Paragraph 6.42 also notes that the existing Local Centres in Preston vary in size, with some having only a handful of units, whilst others are larger and support a number of local shops and basic services, meeting local residents' daily top-up shopping needs. The actual wording of Policy EP4 seeks to prevent the over-proliferation of non-retail uses, at the expense of local retail provision in the local centres, but does allow for non-retail uses, subject to the criteria set out Criteria 2(a) and 2(b) of the policy.

Under the Option 2 proposal, the scheme would include 0.2 ha of land for small scale local facilities. Should these local facilities propose retail or leisure uses, these would fall within Class E. Retail and leisure uses are classed as main town centre uses. Paragraph 89 of the Framework states that for any retail or leisure development outside of town centres, or which are not in accordance with an up-to-date plan, should require a sequential impact assessment for proposals of 2,500m² or greater. The proposed development seeks up to 2,000 square metres (0.2ha) of small scale local facilities, which may include retail or leisure uses. Therefore a sequential assessment is not required for this proposal. The proposed commercial and leisure uses would provide local facilities for future residents of the proposed residential development, together with existing residents within the vicinity of the development. The proposed uses would therefore represent an appropriate mix that would be considered to be sustainably located in relation to the accompanying residential development. On this basis, the proposal would not conflict with Core Strategy Policy 11 and Local Plan Policy EN4.

Policy IN1 of the Local Plan states a preferred route is safeguarded for the PWDR in the location shown on the Policies Map. Planning permission will not be granted for any development that would prejudice the construction of the road.

Part of the application site includes the PWDR, which is currently under construction after receiving planning permission (LCC/2016/0046) from Lancashire County Council in November 2018. This proposal seeks full planning permission for the construction of a roundabout junction within the alignment of the PWDR. The proposed new roundabout junction would be constructed as part of the on-going delivery of the PWDR and would not affect its construction. The proposed residential-led development subject to the outline application would not prevent the completion of the PWDR. Therefore, the proposed

development would comply with Local Plan Policy IN1.

In summary of the above, the principle of the proposed residential development at this site is contrary to Policy 1 of the Adopted Core Strategy and Policy EN1 of the Adopted Local Plan. The development would however not conflict with Policies 11 and 31 of the Adopted Core Strategy and Policies IN1 and EP4 of the adopted Preston Local Plan. Whilst assessing the proposed development against the development plan is the starting point for decision making there are material considerations to be considered, which are detailed below and further in the report.

Background information and material considerations

The PWDR is a major strategic infrastructure project, linking the M55 motorway to the A583/A584 at Clifton, to not only support the delivery of housing in North West Preston but also to improve access to the motorway network from the Enterprise Zone site at Warton. As stated above planning permission for the PWDR and the associated East West Link Road was granted in November 2018 (under planning application LCC/2016/0046). On the 23rd February 2018, notice was given to the applicant (and other landowners) that Lancashire County Council (LCC) had drafted the 'Lancashire County Council (Preston Western Distributor, East West Link and Cottam Link Roads) Compulsory Purchase Order 2018' to authorise LCC to purchase compulsorily the land and new rights as described in the notice. Notice was given on the 6th July 2018 that Public Local Inquiries would be held in connection with the Order. Notice was also given that a Pre-Inquiries Meeting would be held on the 31st July 2018. As part of the Compulsory Purchase Order agreement between the landowners and LCC, it was agreed (in a signed Memorandum of Understanding) that in exchange for the land to build the PWDR the County Council were obligated to work with the applicant to deliver a roundabout (on the route of the PWDR) to allow access to the landowners' parcels of land, including the application site.

Planning permission is required to deliver an additional roundabout on the route of the PWDR because it was not included in the permission granted in November 2018 (under planning application LCC/2016/0046). As stated above the full application of this hybrid application seeks approval for that additional roundabout and also seeks permission to provide direct access to the applicant's existing land holdings surrounding the PWDR. As the construction of the PWDR is on-going, due to be complete by Spring 2023, there is now only a limited window of opportunity to construct the new roundabout as part of the PWDR, thereby forming a synchronised infrastructure project, before the on-going construction is completed at the proposed location of the new roundabout. If the proposed roundabout is not constructed as part of a coordinated approach in the construction of the PWDR, not only would the applicant and LCC fail to meet the agreed deadline within the Memorandum of Understanding (referred to above), but construction of the roundabout as an isolated infrastructure project at a later date would lead to major disruption on this strategic road. Such disruption would no doubt lead to partial demolition of the PWDR prior to the construction of the proposed roundabout, which would substantially increase the cost of the work. Furthermore, if the proposed roundabout is constructed after the opening of the PWDR, it would result in closure of the road, displacing significant amounts of traffic from North West Preston, the Enterprise Zone site at Warton and from the wider vicinity back onto the local highway network, which would completely reverse, albeit for a short-term, the traffic benefits that the PWDR will ultimately deliver.

The proposed roundabout complies with Local Plan Policy IN1. Granting planning permission for the roundabout before the end of March 2021 would enable the roundabout to be constructed as part of the on-going works to the PWDR, which would comply with the economic objective of achieving sustainable development set out in the Framework by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure. If the proposed roundabout is not constructed in the coming months of this year the opportunity to synchronise the delivery of the new roundabout as part of the on-going PWDR construction will be missed and would create severe traffic disruption and substantially increase costs to the applicant, which should be avoided in the interests of achieving sustainable development.

As stated above the full application of this hybrid application also seeks permission to provide direct access to the applicant's existing land holdings surrounding the PWDR. The outline application of this hybrid application proposes two options of predominantly residential development on the applicant's land either side of the PWDR.

The application site was submitted for the Council's Call for Sites exercise, undertaken firstly in 2018 and subsequently in 2019, the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) document has yet to be produced. The PWDR would run through the centre of the application site, linking the M55 motorway to the A583/A584 at Clifton. The PDWR is scheduled to open in Spring 2023 and it would fundamentally change the character of the open countryside in this area of Preston. Whilst the review of the Local Plan is at a very early stage such that it carries no weight in the determination of this planning application, it is clear that the development of a significant infrastructure project, such as the PWDR will inevitably result in irreversible changes to the role, function, purpose and appearance of the open countryside in this part of Preston. Given this and the application site's location, adjacent to the north boundary of the North West Preston Strategic Location, a significant factor in the determination of this application, in the context of the review of the Local Plan, is the extent to which the proposed development can be considered as a sustainable urban extension to Preston. These material considerations can be given significant weight in the planning balance and set this proposal apart from other proposals that the Council has considered recently on land adjacent to but outside of rural, village boundaries.

Housing Provision

In July 2018 the revised Framework was published, which was subsequently updated in February 2019. The Framework, along with revised Planning Practice Guidance, introduced the standard methodology as a mechanism to calculate local housing need. Paragraph 60 of the Framework states that strategic policies should be informed by a local housing need assessment conducted using the standard methodology unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach.

Paragraph 73 of the Framework states that local planning authorities should identify a supply of specific deliverable sites to provide five years' worth of housing against their housing requirements set out in adopted strategic policies, such as Policy 4, or against local housing need where the strategic policies are more than five years old (unless the strategic policies have been reviewed and found not to require updating) with an additional buffer of 5% to ensure choice and competition in the market for land.

Policy 4 of the Core Strategy seeks to deliver a total of 22,158 new dwellings across the three Central Lancashire districts during the plan period of 2010-2026, which sets a requirement of 507 dwellings per annum for Preston. In January 2020 the Council stopped using the Core Strategy housing requirement to assess its housing land supply. This was following continued monitoring of the situation in the period of time following publication of the revised Framework in 2018 and 2019 and the significant change in circumstances which was introduced by national policy at the time, rendering Policy 4 out of date.

At April 2020 the local housing need figure calculated using the standard methodology is 250 dwellings per annum. Against this figure, the Council can currently demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing land.

On 9th March 2021 the Planning Inspectorate issued its decision in relation to an outline planning application proposing 151no dwellings at Cardwell Farm, Barton. The Inspector allowed the appeal and in doing so determined that Core Strategy Policy 4 had been reviewed in 2017 and should be considered as up to date. In doing so he rejected the Council's argument that it could demonstrate a 13.6 year supply of deliverable housing land and accepted the common position of the main parties to the inquiry that should the housing requirement in Policy 4 of the Core Strategy be up to date, the Council could only demonstrate a 4.95 year supply of deliverable housing land and therefore the 'tilted balance' was engaged.

The Council considers in making his decision, the Inspector failed to deal with material considerations which were raised by the Council during the inquiry and which were of considerable importance to the Council's case namely the introduction of the standard method for calculating housing need represented a significant change in circumstances since the 2017 review of the housing requirements in Policy 4 of the Central Lancashire Core Strategy, which justified the use of local housing need as the housing requirement for Preston. Consequently the Council has decided to challenge the decision in the Planning Court.

Whilst the Inspector's decision is lawful until it is set aside and is a material consideration, it is considered the Council should maintain its position as set out above until the challenge has been determined. The Council therefore does not intend to give any material weight to the Inspector's decision in the interim.

The Council maintains that Core Strategy Policy 4 is out of date and by using the standard methodology it can demonstrate a 13.6 year supply of deliverable housing land and the tilted balance is not engaged on housing supply grounds.

A letter submitted by the applicant dated 15th March 2021, following the appeal decision on land at Cardwell Farm, states that a consequence of the appeal being allowed is that 151 dwellings will be added to the five year housing land supply for Preston. It further states in the absence of a fully up to date Local Plan and a confirmed five year housing land supply, the Council would strongly benefit from a sustainable, planned urban extension scheme such as this proposal. Additionally, in the letter, the applicant asserts that high capital costs are associated with the early initial phases of proposed development (in the main due to the delivery of the roundabout) as such the application proposes to deliver a high number of dwellings in the early phase of development, likely to be in the range of 200 plus dwellings, which would make a significant contribution towards the Council's five year

housing land supply.

Affordable Housing

Policy 7 of the Core Strategy seeks to ensure on-site affordable housing provision of 30% within urban areas and of 35% in rural areas subject to such matters as financial viability and contributions to community services. The threshold for that provision is 15 dwellings in the urban parts of Preston and 10 dwellings in rural areas. The Central Lancashire Supplementary Planning Document 1: Affordable Housing states that where an element of affordable housing is required, at least 70% of the units shall be social rented or affordable rented, unless the Council is satisfied that an alternative mix meets an independently assessed proven need and agrees to such alternative provision. The SPD goes on to say that affordable units within residential developments should be dispersed to promote integration, mixed communities and to minimise social exclusion.

The application site is set adjoining the North West Preston Strategic Location, which is an urban fringe location where 30% affordable housing provision is accepted. Therefore, the proposed development would provide 30% on-site affordable housing provision comprising a tenure split of 70% affordable rent and 30% intermediate dwellings and the development would be policy compliant. The applicant has requested that the on-site affordable housing provision be secured by condition, which is under consideration.

The Local Planning Authority has advised that the future consideration of a proportion of the 30% affordable housing provision to be provided off-site by way of financial contribution would also be acceptable. Any financial contribution in lieu of on-site affordable housing provision would need to be secured through a planning obligation and not via condition. Therefore, it is recommendation that the planning obligation secures an option for any future delivery of development of site to be able to consider off-site provision at the detailed design stage. Therefore, subject to the recommended condition and planning obligation, the proposed development would accord with the above policies.

Education

Policy 14 of the Adopted Core Strategy states that educational requirements will be provided for by seeking contributions towards the provision of school places where a development would result in or worsen a lack of capacity at existing schools.

County Education has submitted a revised education assessment (March 2021), which sets out the number of education places needed to mitigate the impacts of the proposed development. The assessment requests a financial contribution towards the provision of 418 primary school places (a claim of £8,315,173.68) and 165 secondary school places (a claim of £3,805,188.75) (based on all of the proposed 1100no. dwellings accommodating 4 bedrooms) are necessary to make the development acceptable. The claim for secondary school places could increase to £3,989,886.45 should the school places be needed at the proposed North West Preston secondary school site. In addition, as a result of the high number of primary school places that have been estimated, the proposed development would be required to incorporate an area of land within the application site for a new primary school with a required site area of 20,040 square metres (c.2ha).

The applicant has agreed to provide the land within the application site to accommodate the school site and the requested financial contribution previously made by County Education in September 2020. The revised March 2021 request from County Education

has been put to the applicant and an update will be provided in Late Changes.

Subject to the update in Late Changes, the proposed development would provide land for a school site and financial contributions towards primary and secondary school places. On this basis the proposed development would accord Core Strategy Policy 14.

Viability – affordable housing, education, highway infrastructure and CIL

Paragraph 57 of the Framework states that where up-to-date policies have set out the contributions expected from development, planning applications that comply with them should be assumed to be viable. It is up to the applicant to demonstrate whether particular circumstances justify the need for a viability assessment at the application stage.

Policy 2 of the Adopted Core Strategy seeks to establish works and/or service requirements that will arise from development and determine what could be met through developer contributions. It further states developer contributions in the form of actual provision of infrastructure, works or facilities and/or financial contributions will be sought through one off negotiations and/or by applying a levy as appropriate.

The proposed development would incur significant upfront infrastructure costs including that for the proposed roundabout and associated utilities costs and the applicant proposes to deliver a high number of dwellings in the early phases of development, likely to be in the range of 200 plus dwellings. In order to spread and balance costs to deliver the entire scheme the applicant has proposed the following provision and trigger points.

- 251st home - £150k for public transport, £25k for local sports, 5% (or equivalent) affordable housing
- 376th home - £150k for public transport, £25k for local sports, 5% (or equivalent) affordable housing
- 501st home - £150k for public transport, £25k for local sports, 5% (or equivalent) affordable housing
- 626th home - £150k for public transport, £25k for local sports, 5% (or equivalent) affordable housing
- 750th home - £150k for public transport, £25k for local sports, 5% (or equivalent) affordable housing
- 875th home - £150k for public transport, £25k for local sports, 5% (or equivalent) affordable housing

The financial contributions towards education and the school site would not be covered by the above triggers. It is considered that the proposed triggers for the commitments are acceptable. They would allow the developer to deliver the first phase(s) of the development up to the 251st dwelling prior to the commitments, which would accommodate the initial infrastructure costs that would be incurred. Overall, the whole development would provide the full level commitments at an appropriate stage of the development and prior to the final completion of the development. Therefore, Core Strategy Policy 2 and paragraph 57 of the Framework.

Impact on Landscape Character and Visual Amenity

Policy 13 of the Core Strategy requires development to conserve and where possible enhance the character and quality of the landscape. Policy 21 of the Adopted Core

Strategy does not seek to prevent development in principle, but does seek to ensure that any development that does take place is compatible with its surroundings, further stating that it should contribute positively to its conservation or restoration or the creation of appropriate new features.

The Framework states that the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside should be recognised, with the planning system contributing to and enhancing the natural and local environment. However the Framework does not seek to protect all countryside from development; rather it concentrates on the protection of “valued” and “distinctive” landscapes and seeks to encourage development on previously developed land.

The applicant has submitted a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), which has been prepared in accordance with the published Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (3rd Edition). The LVIA assesses the landscape and visual characteristics of the site; assesses the proposal and provides recommendations in relation to key landscape and visual mitigation requirements; and identifies and assesses the potential landscape and visual impact of the proposed development.

The LVIA identifies that the site includes mature field trees, some of which are classified as being of veteran status, together with established hedgerows, which characterise the internal site area. In addition Bartle Wetlands, occupies the north eastern corner of the site. The LVIA states that the site is located within the relatively low lying and undulating landscape of the coastal plains. The surrounding landscape to the north, west and north east is characterised by a mosaic of mid to large scale, arable and pastoral fields bound by a network of established hedgerows and hedgerow trees. There are also pockets of established woodland and occasional field trees within the wider landscape, which complement the distinctly rural landscape, with rural road and lanes and small farmsteads present in the area.

The LVIA assesses the landscape effects and the visual effects of the proposed development and considers the potential impacts both during the construction and operational phases of development. It identifies that the proposed development would give rise to a number of potential significant adverse effects during the construction and early completion phases of the development and if left without mitigation would result in a demonstrable adverse impact upon the landscape and visual amenity. The LVIA states that this would be limited to the immediate locality and middle distance receptors. Mature field boundaries, the topography and existing tree coverage would afford a good degree of physical and visual containment to the site. The LVIA sets out through mitigation and compensation measures, the development could be constructed to significantly reduce the adverse landscape and visual effects, to successfully integrate the development into the existing and surrounding landscape. The development would represent a stark change to the existing open, pastoral agricultural landscape, but be deemed appropriate when considered in relation to the expansion of North West Preston and the Preston Western Distributor Road.

The City Council’s Landscape Architect has reviewed the submitted LVIA and has advised that the submitted information is acceptable. It is considered that all necessary aspects are included within the applicant’s LVIA, which identifies the site to comprise of Medium landscape overall, whilst the wider landscape setting is of a High landscape value overall. The application site comprises of agricultural fields on relatively poor quality soils and there

are no landscape designations of a national or local level. The site does however include Bartle Wetlands BHS. The Landscape Architect agrees with the summary and conclusions identified within the LVIA and raises no objection to the proposed development subject to conditions requiring detailed landscape information to be submitted at reserved matters stage, which considers the location and context, together with details of public open space, the retention and mitigation measures hedgerows, field boundaries, trees, ecology and ponds to be retained. Therefore, is it considered that subject to the appropriate details of development being secured at reserved matters stage, the proposed development would not result in an unacceptable adverse impact upon landscape character and visual amenity and would comply with Core Strategy Policies 13 and 21, together with the Framework.

Trees

The Framework seeks to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and states that development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (Ancient Woodlands and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists. Opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments should be encouraged, including net gains for biodiversity.

The submitted Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment (TSIA) identifies a total of 168 trees on the site and outside of the boundary, which have the potential to be impacted by the proposed development. These trees are identified with the following categories:

- Category A – 47
- Category B – 50
- Category C – 39
- Category U – 21

As part of the proposed development a total of 65 trees, groups of trees, hedgerows and woodlands have been identified for removal within the following categories:

- Category A – 9
- Category B – 21
- Category C – 21
- Category U – 14

Of these, 7 trees are categorised as veteran or ancient specimens and 4 are subject to tree preservation orders. The removal of these trees would be as a direct result of the creation of the proposed new roundabout junction and access spur roads to the PWDR. The remaining 54 trees and features, proposed to be removed are not categorised as veteran or ancient specimens, or subject to statutory protection. 14 of the trees are recommended for removal irrespective of the proposed development as a result of their poor condition. The submitted TSIA states that the majority of the remaining trees, which are proposed to be removed are located internally within the site and their removal would have a limited negative impact upon the overall tree stock or wider community. The proposed development includes the incorporation of replacement planting within the landscaping scheme to mitigate the loss of existing trees, which would result in a net gain in tree/canopy coverage and improve visual amenity over the long-term. In addition retained trees will be protected through protective fencing and ground protection measures.

The Council's Arborist advises that the proposals appear to be reasonably well designed in order to retain the majority of the existing tree stock, but considers that more trees could be incorporated into the overall design of the development. The land currently comprises of largely agricultural fields with the volume of the trees being located on the perimeter boundaries. Individual specimen trees are scattered around the fields as well as some groups of woodland areas. The trees scattered centrally within the agricultural fields are predominantly outlined for felling in order to create the proposed dwellings. The Arborist advises that many of the trees that would be affected by the proposed development are not suitable for retention due to their condition and problems associated with species close to the proposed new properties. Some trees could cause concern if retained within a residential setting, in that the tree cover surrounding the perimeters is likely to cause conflict to the occupiers of the new properties due to shading issues.

The Council's Arborist has identified six trees within TSIA that could be retained but are proposed to be felled within the outline planning application. As part of any future reserved matters application, an updated review of these trees would be undertaken and retention can be incorporated into the proposed design layout. Overall, the Arborist advises that a high volume of trees would remain as part of the proposed development. He further considers that along with mitigation tree planting and the woodland area to the north-east of the site, there would provide a good mix of tree cover within and surrounding the proposed development. Therefore, the proposed development would not have an adverse impact upon trees and the proposal would not conflict with the Framework.

Design and Layout

Core Strategy Policy 17 states the design of new buildings will be expected to take account of the character and appearance of the local area, being sympathetic to surrounding land uses and occupiers and avoiding demonstrable harm to the amenities of the local area. Core Strategy Policy 5 seeks to secure densities of development which are in keeping with local areas and which will have no detrimental impact on the character, appearance and distinctiveness of an area, whilst also making efficient use of land.

Policy EN9 of the Adopted Local Plan states that all new development proposals should be designed with regard to the principles set out and explained in the Central Lancashire Design Guide SPD, which are movement and legibility; mix of uses and tenures; adaptability and resilience; resources and efficiency; architecture and townscape. The policy states applications will be approved where they accord with the Design Guide SPD, Core Strategy, national policy and CABI (Commission for Architecture and Built Environment) guidance; make a positive contribution to the character and local distinctiveness of the area; and are accompanied by a satisfactory Design and Access Statement that fully explains and justifies the design approach for the scheme.

The Design Guide SPD seeks to raise the level and quality of design of new buildings, sets out a number of well-established principles of good design and how these can achieve a clear and robust design concept for a site.

Paragraph 124 of the Framework states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, and the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Paragraph 130 states permission

should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, taking into account any local design standards or style guides in plans or supplementary planning documents. In addition, the National Design Guide illustrates how well-designed places can be achieved and sets out the Government's priorities for well-designed places in the form of ten characteristics.

The applicant has submitted a Design and Access Statement (DAS) which identifies the existing site constraints, including the PWDR which is currently under construction. The DAS then sets out the masterplan for the proposed development, which incorporates both the full and outline application proposals. For the outline residential-led proposals, the DAS incorporates indicative layout and parameters. The application site is separated into three parcels of land, which the DAS sets out would be developed within four zones. The large parcel of land set between Bartle Lane and the M55, which would lead up to Bartle Hall Hotel and Lea Lane, would have the PWDR running central through it in a north-south direction. As such, the proposed full application for the roundabout junction would create two direct access points off the PWDR into this parcel land. Zones A and B would be located either side of the PWDR, which would accommodate up to 667 dwellings (Option 1) and up to 617 dwellings, together with primary school and local facilities (Option 2). Zone C would be located to the west of Lea Lane and to the north of Blackleach Lane and would accommodate up to 178 dwellings. Zone D, which is the southernmost parcel of land would be located on the south side of Blackleach Lane spanning up to the boundary with Fylde Borough Council. Zone D would accommodate up to 233 dwellings.

The DAS sets out the character areas of the proposed development, which seeks to incorporate existing features of the site into the development. In addition, details of public realm to be incorporated into future reserved matters submissions are set out, including traditional estate roads, shared spaces and private drives. Details of the proposed housing mix for each zone of development is included, which would vary between 1no bedroom apartments up to 5no bedroom dwellings. The DAS sets out the proposed mix of house types which would comprise:

Property Type	Number	% of development
1 bed apartments	25	2
2 bed apartments	44	4
2 bed mews dwellings	141	14
3 bed mews dwellings	142	14
2 bed semi-detached dwellings	114	11
3 bed detached dwellings	55	5
3 bed mews dwellings	123	12
4 bed mews dwellings	136	13
4 bed detached dwellings	49	5
4 bed detached dwellings (larger)	115	11
5 bed detached dwellings	51	5
5 bed detached dwellings (larger)	33	3

The proposed housing mix sets out an indicative provision on the site based on 1,028 dwellings and seeks to accommodate a varied mix of housing types within the

development. The precise number of units would be secured as part of any future reserved matters application.

The DAS has been subject of much discussion between officers and the applicant. The applicant has provided amended versions in order to provide additional detail to establish the design principles of the proposed scheme and how the scheme has been designed to create a sustainable development and a sustainable community. These discussions have resulted in the applicant agreeing to provide a Design Code for the proposed development, which would provide a set of illustrated design requirements that provide specific, detailed parameters for the physical development of a site or area. The use of Design Codes for a large scale development, such as this proposal would allow the code to be reviewed as development progresses over time. The Design Code would apply to all development on site, including the residential properties, mixed use, together with open space, landscape and public realm requirements. As the development of the site is estimated to take up to 10 years, the Design Code would be a benefit in allowing future improvements in design in the forthcoming years to be incorporated into the development. Therefore, subject to the Design Code being secured, the proposed design and layout would be considered to be acceptable.

Fylde Borough Council in their objection to the application, raise concern that the proposed development would result in visual harm to the Fylde district area and rural landscape. In particular the submitted indicative Overall Masterplan Layout shows development up to the district boundary with Fylde in Zone D. Fylde states that the layout indicates that the development would have back gardens of residential properties facing this boundary, which would result in an insensitive boundary treatment through a continuous run of back garden fences abutting the Fylde boundary. In assessing the objection from Fylde Borough Council, officers concur that the present layout would create an unsatisfactory design of development and relationship between the development and the adjoining agricultural land and district boundary. However, the Overall Masterplan has been submitted for indicative proposes only, to demonstrate that the level of development proposed could be accommodated on the site. Details of design and layout are not sought through this application. Should outline planning permission be granted for the residential-led development, the design and layout details would be considered at reserved matters stage. It is therefore considered that the design issues raised by Fylde could be addressed during the assessment of any future reserved matters application.

It is considered that subject to the Design Code being secured for the proposed development, which would establish satisfactory detailed parameters for future reserved matters application, the proposed design and layout would be acceptable and would accord with Core Strategy Policies 5 and 17, Local Plan Policy EN9, the Design Guide SPD, National Design Guide and the Framework.

Open Space and Sports Provision

Policy 17 of the Core Strategy states that the provision of landscaping and open space should form an integral part of new development proposals, including enhancing the public realm. Policy 18 seeks to manage and improve environmental resources through the protection and enhancement of the natural environment. Policy 24 seeks to promote access to sport and recreation facilities, including children's play provision, through developer contributions where new development would result in a shortfall in provision.

Policy HS3 of the Adopted Local Plan requires this scheme to provide sufficient Public Open Space to meet the recreational needs of the development in accordance with standards set out in the Central Lancashire Open Space and Playing Pitch SPD. On-site provision of amenity green space and active play facilities for children/young people (i.e. play equipment) would be required as the development would be over the 100 dwelling threshold level.

The Framework states ‘access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and physical activity make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities’. It advises that Local Planning Authorities should seek to protect and enhance Public Rights of Way.

The requirement for open space and sports provision for the proposed development will be generated by the proposed residential-led development, which is subject to the outline application. The application proposes a maximum number of up to 1,100 dwellings (Option 1) and based on this, it is estimated that the open space requirement for the proposed development would be:

Open Space	Development Requirement (ha)
Parks and gardens	4.58ha
Semi-natural greenspace	4.50ha
Amenity greenspace	1.36ha
Provision for children and young people	0.05ha
Allotments	0.43ha
Playing pitches	2.56ha

The application states that open space provision to be provided would be determined at reserved matters stage. The applicant states that the proposed scheme would include an agreement for open space provision to be provided on-site and what level of provision would be sought through an off-site contribution. Each zone of the proposed development would include an area of open space, which are intended to be prominently located around veteran field trees to allow natural spaces to embed within the development. The open space would be centrally located to ensure visual amenity and outlook for the proposed dwellings.

Sport England advise that the occupants of the proposed development would generate a demand for sporting provision and existing provision within the area may not be able to accommodate the potential increased demand. The proposed development should therefore contribute towards meeting the demand through on-site facilities and/or providing additional capacity off-site (through financial contributions). Sport England advise that the additional demand for outdoor sports pitches from the proposed development would require match equivalent and training sessions that equate to just under two and a half pitches (£304,383 and lifecycle cost of £43,062). This additional demand would generate the need for 2.88 changing rooms at £482,709 (indicative cost). Shortfalls in the existing provision would be exacerbated by new residents of the proposed development. In order to meet this demand Sport England request that on-site and/or off-site provision is secured through a Planning Obligation, which will establish the required needs once the detailed design and number of properties is established.

In terms of indoor sport, Sport England advise that the proposed development would likely generate a demand for a sports hall and swimming pool facilities. This demand is likely to equate to £439,021 for a sports hall and £459,004 for swimming pools, which is estimated based on the potential additional visits to existing sports halls and swimming pools in the local area. Sport England therefore recommend that indoor sports provision should be secured either through existing facilities that can accommodate the demand; improvements to existing facilities to accommodate the demand; or through a financial contribution towards planned new provision. Sport England recommend that as part of reserved matters submissions, the design and layout of the proposed development incorporates the concept of active design to promote the role of sport and physical activity in accordance with Sport England guidance.

As the residential-led development is subject to the outline application, the precise level of open space and sports provision would be determined through the detailed design of the development at reserved matters stage. The application sets out that the proposed development would include on-site public open space to support the development. In addition, the applicant has committed to provide a financial contribution of £150,000 towards off-site sports provision within the local area, which is considered to be acceptable. This financial contribution would be secured through the planning obligation. Subject to a satisfactory provision of open space and sports provision being secured, the proposed development would accord with the principle of Core Strategy Policies 17, 18 and 24, Local Plan Policy HS3 and the Framework.

Impact on Residential Amenity

Policy 17 of the Core Strategy and Policy EN9 of the Adopted Local Plan state that the design of new buildings will be expected to take account of the character and appearance of the local area, being sympathetic to surrounding land uses and occupiers and avoiding demonstrable harm to the amenities of the local area. Policy AD1(a) of the Adopted Local Plan requires, amongst other things, that the development has no adverse impact on residential amenity. The Framework seeks to ensure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

There are existing residential properties, which are located adjacent the application site boundary on Bartle Lane, Blackleach Lane, Lea Lane and Rosemary Lane. These properties are located next to the proposed residential-led development subject to the outline application. As the proposal is in outline with all matters reserved, issues relating to impacts on privacy, overlooking, loss of light and overshadowing cannot be fully assessed at this stage. The indicative Overall Masterplan Layout Plan demonstrates that the proposed development could be satisfactorily accommodated on site without having any unacceptable adverse impacts on the amenities of the occupiers of the existing properties which border the site. The specific details and layout of the proposed development would be established at reserved matters stage. Therefore, it is considered the proposal would not conflict with the above policies or the Framework.

Issues regarding the potential noise impact of the development upon the occupiers of the neighbouring properties is considered within the assessment of the Environmental Statement, later in this report.

Traffic and Highway Safety

Core Strategy Policy 2 states that the Local Planning Authority will work with infrastructure providers to establish works that will arise from or be made worse by development proposals. It further states that the Local Planning Authority will set broad priorities on the provision of the infrastructure to ensure that it is delivered in line with future growth. Core Strategy Policy 3 outlines a number of measures which are considered to constitute the best approach to planning for travel. These include reducing the need to travel, improving pedestrian facilities, improving opportunities for cycling, improving public transport, enabling travellers to change their mode of travel on trips, encouraging car sharing, managing car use and improving the road network.

Policy ST2 of the Adopted Local Plan requires development proposals to demonstrate that the efficient and convenient movement of all highway users and corridors which could be developed as future transport routes are not prejudiced, that existing pedestrian, cycle and equestrian routes are protected and extended; the needs of disabled people are fully provided for; appropriate provision is made for vehicular access, off-street servicing, vehicle parking and public transport services; and that appropriate measures are included for road safety and to facilitate access on foot and by bicycle. Adopted Local Plan Policy ST1 requires new development proposals to provide car parking and servicing space in accordance with the parking standards contained within the Appendix B to the Adopted Local Plan.

Paragraph 32 of the Framework states that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe

On the 23rd February 2018, notice was given to the applicant and other landowners that LCC had drafted the 'Lancashire County Council (Preston Western Distributor, East West Link and Cottam Link Roads) Compulsory Purchase Order 2018' to authorise LCC to purchase compulsorily the land and new rights as described in the notice. Notice was given on the 6th July 2018 that Public Local Inquiries would be held in connection with the Order. Notice was also given that a Pre-Inquiries Meeting would be held on the 31st July 2018. As part of the Compulsory Purchase Order agreement between the landowners and LCC, it was agreed (in a signed Memorandum of Understanding) that in exchange for the land to build the PWDR the County Council were obligated to work with the applicant to deliver a roundabout (on the route of the PWDR) to allow access to the landowners' parcels of land, including the application site. The proposed development comprises a full application for the proposed new junction roundabout and access slips roads, which (should planning permission be granted) would be constructed as part of the on-going construction works of the PWDR.

Proposed roundabout

The submitted application states that the proposed roundabout junction has been informed by the PWDR development and has been designed to be provide access to the new infrastructure and development from the applicant's land; improve accessibility within the area through the future access provision to the wider surrounding area; and provide a series of local access junctions within the development to the existing adopted highway network.

County Highways has advised that the proposed roundabout junction is acceptable, subject to detailed construction design. The applicant has taken the approach to ensure the roundabout junction can be constructed as part of the on-going construction works to the PWDR, which is seen as a reasonable approach. The proposed roundabout would include two access slips roads to land to the east and west of the PWDR that would allow access to the adjoining land (which is subject to the outline proposals).

The proposed roundabout development would include a 2m wide at the edge of the roundabout and a 3m wide footway/cycle way to provide connectivity and encourage the use of different modes of transport within the area. In addition, a staggered signalised crossing would be provided to allow for pedestrian and cycle crossing of the PWDR. County Highways advised that these arrangements are acceptable. County Highways has raised the matter of further connectivity across the PWDR for the wider proposals and further clarification is sought. The planning permission for the PWDR includes two underpasses, located to the north and south of the proposed roundabout junction, which the applicant proposes to provide pedestrian and cycle connections too. It is considered that based on the response from County Highways, the roundabout junction is acceptable and connection details can be secured through conditions attached to any permission granted.

Access to the existing local highway network

In relation to the proposed access to the existing local highway, this would come forward through the outline development proposals. The indicative proposals identify that a bus gate/emergency access would be provided with Zone A (land to the east of the PWDR). The proposed local access points would be T-junctions with two access points to the east and west of Rosemary Lane, one to Bartle Lane, one to Lea Lane, and two access points north and south of Blackleach Lane. In order to facilitate the proposed accesses, speed limits on Rosemary Lane, Lea Lane and Bartle Lane would be reduced from 60mph to 30mph. County Highways advise they would be satisfied with this approach for the proposed local accesses.

County Highways raise concern in regard to the Bartle Lane junction, which would, according to the indicative plans, provide a sole access point for 100no dwellings within Zone A. This would prevent those properties from accessing the PWDR and only provide access to Bartle Lane. County Highways recommend that at detailed design stage, under future reserved matters submissions for the proposed accesses, the bus gate/emergency vehicle access is located at the Bartle Lane junction and all properties within the development are provided with access to the PWDR. Through the phased delivery of the development, there may be the potential to permit a limited number of properties to access Bartle Lane on a temporary basis, whilst the connections to the PWDR are complete.

Sustainability – pedestrian and cycle links and public transport

The submitted Transport Assessment (TA) acknowledges that the site does not currently include the level of pedestrian and cycle infrastructure required to support the proposed residential-led development and that off-site highway improvements would be required to the local highway network. County Highways agree with the TA and advise that local improvements would need to be secured from the developer. These off-site improvements would be secured between the applicant and County Highways through a legal obligation between the two parties and their delivery would be secured by conditions attached to the planning permission. Subject to satisfactory details being secured, these works would

provide improvements to, and prevent any severe impact upon, the local network.

In terms of public transport, the nearest bus stops are location adjacent to The Sitting Goose Public House on Lea Lane. This bus stop is located up to 1km away from the north-eastern extent of the application site. Currently Bus Service 74 (Preston-Fleetwood) operates a seven days-a-week service with an average one hourly service Monday to Saturday and a bus every two hours on Sundays. The submitted TA proposes a Public Transport Strategy which proposes to build on the existing provision and draw upon the planned public transport improvements within the North West Preston Masterplan. County Highways advise that any diversion of the bus service and increased frequency may require developer funding of £900,000, which could be secured through a planning obligation and they request that the developer agrees to bus service routing and service frequency, together with appropriate target dates tied to the building and phasing of the proposed development. In addition, the detailed design of the layout for the residential-led development would require consideration of bus service routing through the development. The applicant has confirmed their agreement to the financial contribution towards public transport, which would be secured by the planning obligation and the bus service routing would be considered at reserved matters stage.

In summary, County Highways advise that proposals do not provide evidence of safe and suitable access for all road users to the wider site, priority to pedestrian and cycle movements and high quality public transport. As set out above, the details for the bus service and layout within the development would be secured through the planning obligation and the routing would be secured at reserved matters stage. Further discussions are continuing between the applicant and County Highways regarding the road users and pedestrian and cycle movements. These relate to the outline areas of the proposed development and would also be secured either at reserved matters stage or through a planning obligation. Any further information provided will be reported in the late changes report.

Traffic generation

In relation to the proposed traffic impacts of the proposed development, the submitted TA estimates the full delivery of the development to be complete by 2034, which also allows for the delivery of North West Preston and Cottam Hall. The TA assesses the potential traffic impact upon M55 Junction 2; the Saddle Inn signalised roundabout junction; and the proposed roundabout junction on the PWDR. M55 Junction 2 falls under the jurisdiction of Highways England, who have placed a holding direction upon the approval of the development up to 26th February 2021. An update on this will be provided in Late Changes.

County Highways advise that the TA found that the network changes combined with increased demand on the network would contribute towards a reduced usage of the PWDR in both the AM and PM peaks. The reduced flow on the PWDR would result from the impact of new development trips and highway changes to existing trips which would travel west along the A583 (Blackpool Road), which would reduce traffic flow on the PWDR and M55 Junction 2 and 3. In addition, there is potential for a small increase in traffic flow on the M55 between Junctions 1 and 2, resulting from new development trips. The estimated reduced flow on the PWDR is anticipated as the impact of the new development trips and highway changes would result in a number of the existing trips travelling along the A583 (Blackpool Road/Riversway).

The TA also assesses the capacity of the proposed roundabout junction on the PWDR and the Saddle Inn signalised roundabout, which shows the proposed roundabout junction would operate within the capacity of the PWDR during peak periods at 2034 forecast traffic flows. County Highways state that, on the basis of the TA, the proposed site roundabout junction would be acceptable, subject to the inclusion of further pedestrian provision/subway connection and bridleway use.

In terms of the internal layout of the development, County Highways advise that as this forms part of the outline proposals, detailed design would be secured at reserved matters stage. Advice is provided in terms of any future layout to incorporate bus service routing, adopted estate roads standards, parking provision and surface water drainage. County Highways also advise that a Full Travel Plan should be secured for the residential-led development and a financial contribution of £12,000 towards the monitoring of the Travel Plan, which would be secured through condition and the contribution through a legal obligation.

Highways England has considered the potential impact of the proposed development upon Junction 1 to 3 of the M55 motorway together with the PWDR which will link to M55 Junction 2 that is currently under construction. Highways England in principle raise no objection to the proposed development, but has advised that the proposed development would bring forward a large, speculative site outside of the Local Plan-making process and as such funding improvements to Junction 1 and 2 to address future year traffic impacts would not be secured. As there is no certainty that improvement schemes to address the future year traffic impacts at either junction could be delivered, Highways England has recommended that should planning permission be granted the following conditions should be attached in the interests of highway safety and to ensure that the M55 motorway continues to operate effectively. The recommended conditions include:

- A Travel Plan for each phase and associated coordinator being in place from the point of the occupation of the first unit for a period of not less than five years;
- A surface water drainage strategy to demonstrate how surface water can be dealt on site to avoid surface waters passing onto the M55 motorway;
- Reserved matters submission to be in accordance with surface water drainage strategy;
- No connection between the site drainage and the M55 motorway drainage system;
- Construction plan and method statement for earthworks and drainage alongside M55 motorway; and
- Details of boundary fencing along northern boundary of site and M55 motorway.

Subject to the above conditions, Highways England would raise no objection to the proposed development.

In conclusion, it is considered that subject to the details and commitments being secured for the outline development areas in relation to safe and suitable access for all road users and the provision of pedestrian and cycle movement priorities, together with the public transport commitments, the proposed development would not result in any severe impacts upon the local and strategic highway network, including the M55 motorway. On this basis, subject to satisfactory details being secured, the proposed development would accord with Core Strategy Policies 2 and 3, Local Plan Policy ST2 and the Framework. Parking provision required under Local Plan Policy ST1 would be established at reserved matters

stage.

Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area) Act 1990 (LBCA Act) relates specifically to listed buildings and states "In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses".

Policy 16 of the Core Strategy aims to protect and seek opportunities to enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting, which include safeguarding heritage assets from inappropriate development that would cause harm to their significance.

Policy EN8 of the Adopted Local Plan sets out the circumstances in which proposals affecting a heritage asset or its setting will be permitted and the exceptional circumstances in which proposals involving the total or substantial loss of heritage assets will be permitted.

Paragraph 189 of the Framework requires an applicant to describe the heritage assets affected by a proposal, and that the level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance.

When determining planning applications involving heritage assets, paragraph 192 of the Framework states that local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of the heritage asset; the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities; and the positive contribution new developments can make to the local character and distinctiveness.

Paragraph 193 of the Framework requires that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater weight should be applied, and this is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

Paragraph 194 of the Framework goes on to state that any harm to, or loss of, a heritage asset requires clear and convincing justification, and substantial harm to, or loss of grade II listed buildings should be exceptional.

Paragraph 196 identifies that where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

Paragraph 197 of the Framework states that the effect of an application on the significance of non-designated heritage assets should be taken into account and a balanced judgement will be required in the assessment having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

The submitted Heritage and Archaeological Assessment (HAA) states that there are no designated built heritage assets within the application site or immediately adjacent to it and as such, the proposed development would not have any direct impact on any nationally important built heritage or archaeological assets. The HAA identifies one designated built heritage asset at Anderton House, which is a Grade II listed building (set 70m west of the application site, on the south side of Blackleach Lane). The proposed development would alter the wider setting of Anderton House and result in a less than substantial impact upon the significance of the heritage asset. The HAA sets out that the level of harm would be mitigated through appropriate landscaping along the site boundaries.

In regards to paragraph 196 of the Framework, the public benefits of the proposed development can be described as those in paragraph 8 of the Framework; sustaining or enhancing the significance of a heritage asset and the contribution of its setting; reducing or removing risks to a heritage asset; or securing its optimum viable use. With regards to paragraph 8, in this case, the proposed development would be located in an area of Preston where the open and rural character of the open countryside would fundamentally change due to the completion of the PWDR, which would alter its role, function, purpose and appearance, hence the visual impact of the proposed development would be limited. Delivering housing in this urban fringe location would support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of new homes, set out in paragraph 50 of the Framework. The application site can be considered as a sustainable urban extension to Preston and, as stated above, would not be harmful to the role, function, purpose and appearance of the open countryside in this part of Preston. This sets this proposal apart from other proposals that the Council has considered recently on land adjacent to but outside of rural, village boundaries. Furthermore granting planning permission for the proposed roundabout before the end of March 2021 would enable the roundabout to be constructed as part of the on-going works to the PWDR, which would comply with economic objective of achieving sustainable development set out in the Framework by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure. The policy compliant affordable housing provision, education provision and land for a primary school site would also be a benefit of the proposed development. In addition to these public benefits the proposed development would sustain the significance of a heritage asset and the contribution of its setting. In weighing the harm to the setting of the listed building against the public benefits of the proposal it is considered that the public benefits are sufficient to outweigh the (slight/moderate) less than substantial harm identified to the grade II listed building. This harm to the setting should be given considerable importance and weight, in accordance with Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Even if the harm is considered less than substantial, any balancing exercise must have regard to the overarching statutory duty imposed by Section 66(1) of the Act.

The HAA identifies three non-designated built heritage assets, which are The Sitting Goose Public House, Ivy Farm and The Old Schoolhouse. The proposed development would alter the rural setting of these heritage assets, which is also currently being altered through the construction works of the PWDR. The development would erode the rural setting of The Sitting Goose Public House and Ivy Farm, which the HAA identifies as being 'minor'. In terms of The Old Schoolhouse, the HAA states that views between the heritage asset and the application site do not contribute to the understanding of the significance of this heritage asset and therefore the proposed development would preserve the historic interest

of this non-designated heritage asset.

The HAA identifies four non-designated archaeological heritage assets within the site. One is identified as 'Medium to High Value' and three as 'Low Value'. The HAA states that there is low potential for previously unrecorded heritage assets to be present, based on evidence gathered as part of the preparation of the HAA. County Archaeology advise that the potential significance of below ground archaeological remains is considered to be low, however as the site covers a large area, there may be potential for unknown archaeological sites to be encountered. The deserted medieval settlement of Bartle, although recorded as lying within the proposed development, is probably located around the current areas known as Lower and Higher Bartle. Within the site, there are a number of sandstone gateposts that would be adversely impacted by the proposed development. In addition, as the site area measures c.45ha there is potential for previously unknown sites of archaeological interest to be encountered. It is therefore recommended that as set out in the HAA, a programme of post-determination evaluation be undertaken prior to construction works commencing, which can be secured by condition.

In conclusion, the Council has given special regard to the preservation of the setting of one identified designated heritage asset has been given as required by the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, and through the above assessment has identified less than substantial harm to that asset, and it is considered this harm would be outweighed by public benefits as a result of the development. Subject to the aforementioned condition, it is considered that the application accords with Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Policy 16 of the adopted Core Strategy, Policy EN8 of the adopted Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework

Energy Efficiency

Core Strategy Policy 27 seeks to incorporate sustainable resources into new development and requires that for non-residential development, proposals achieve minimum energy efficiency standards for all new buildings of BREEAM 'very good' and where possible in urban areas 'excellent'.

Whilst Core Strategy Policy 27 requires all new dwellings meet Level 4 of the former Code for Sustainable Homes (CSH), the Government has published a statement of intention in respect of this matter, and in accordance with this statement of intention the Council no longer requires new developments to comply with code standards. However the written ministerial statement (published on 25th March 2015) confirms that for the specific issue of energy performance, Local Planning Authorities will continue to be able to set and apply policies in their Local Plans which require compliance with energy performance standards that exceed the energy requirements of Building Regulations. Therefore, the Council requires only the energy efficiency levels of new developments to be equivalent to Level 4 of the former CSH which equates to a 19% improvement in the Dwelling Emission Rate (DER) over the Target Emission Rate (TER) as defined by Part L1A of the 2013 Building Regulations.

The proposed residential-led development has been submitted in outline. As such, no detailed energy efficiency information has been provided as this would be established through the detailed design of the development, should permission be granted. As such,

details of energy efficiency standards for the dwellings and commercial, leisure and school buildings can be secured by condition. Therefore, subject to satisfactory details being secured, the proposed development would accord with Core Strategy Policy 27.

Waste Management

The National Planning Policy for Waste seeks to ensure that new development makes sufficient provision for waste management and promotes good design to secure the integration of waste management facilities, for example by ensuring there is discrete provision for bins to facilitate a high quality, comprehensive and frequent household collection service.

Waste Management advise that the submitted swept path analysis is satisfactory to demonstrate that Council waste and recycling vehicles could access the development safely. The residential development forms part of the outline application and as such, the detailed layout of the development does not form part of the assessment of the application. The applicant has submitted an indicative site layout and Waste Management advise that should outline permission be granted, the detailed layout of the development would need to provide satisfactory access for Council vehicles within the site and that facilities are provided for future residents to be able to present their bins at the kerbside on collection days. Therefore, it is recommended that a condition is attached to any permission granted which requires the submission of a Waste Management Plan as part of any future reserved matters submission. Subject to a satisfactory Waste Management Plan being secured, the proposed development would accord with the National Planning Policy for Waste.

Employment Skills

Policy 15 of the Core Strategy seeks to improve skills and economic inclusion and the Central Lancashire Employment Skills SPD requires all full or reserved matters applications for more than 30 dwellings to produce an Employment and Skills Plan.

The proposed highway works subject to the full application would not trigger a requirement for an Employment and Skills Plan. The proposed residential development would be subject to this requirement, which is applied for under the outline application. As such, there is no requirement for an Employment Skills Statement to be provided at this stage. However, in order to allow for local residents to benefit from the employment and training opportunities available during the construction phase of the proposed development, a condition requiring Employment and Skills Plans to be submitted with all future reserved matters applications is recommended to be attached to any outline planning approval. Subject to the Employment and Skills Plan being secured, the proposed development would accord with Core Strategy Policy 15 and the Central Lancashire Employment Skills SPD.

Environmental Impact Assessment

The planning application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES). The development is considered to be an 'Urban Development Project' including more than 150 dwellings, the overall site area exceeds 5ha and which is likely to have significant effects on the environment. In addition, Option 2 includes non-residential urban development which would exceed 1ha. The ES outlines the likely effects of the proposed development on different aspects of the environment, both in terms of the construction phase and the

operational phase of the completed development, the methods used to assess the effects and the mitigation measures proposed to address these environmental effects.

In accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England) Regulations 2017 the ES provides an outline of the need for the development, and the alternatives to the proposed development, which include the 'do nothing' scenario, alternative proposals within the application site and the reason for the alternative put forward for consideration. The 'do nothing' scenario would retain the existing land and the ES states that this would mean that any negative environmental impacts would not be realised and the applicant and LCC would fail to meet the agreed deadline within the Memorandum of Understanding (referred to above). However, if the proposed development was not to be implemented, the potential benefits of the proposal would not be realised, which include:

- Increased accessibility within the surrounding area through the proposed new roundabout junction to the PWDR;
- A significant boost to the delivery of housing in Preston;
- A significant economic boost, including £200m capital investment, 330.7 direct full-time jobs (FTE) per annum and 363.8 indirect and induced FTE jobs within the local supply chain, and £2.2m in Council Tax annually;
- The introduction of significant environmental improvements through landscaping and biodiversity enhancements and overall visual appearance, including Bartle Wetlands Biological Heritage Site to be retained, protected and enhanced, and the retention of enhancements of trees, hedges and woodlands;
- The potential opportunities to enhance the habitats available to wildlife on site;
- 30% affordable housing provision;
- Education provision and land for a primary school site;
- Public transport provision; and
- On-site and off-site sports provision.

The ES sets out the alternatives, which have been considered. These include the originally proposed location of roundabout being set further north, during pre-application discussions/consultation, together with an outline proposal for solely residential development. In response to the discussions and comments received following the public consultation, carried out by the applicant, the scheme has been amended to relocate the roundabout in order to avoid a culvert and the residential-led outline proposals include Option 2 which include the provision for a primary school and local facilities.

Having regard to the complex nature of the application site in environmental terms, and the scale of development, the ES includes the following assessments:

- Ground conditions
- Hydrology/flood risk, including drainage
- Ecology
- Transportation
- Noise
- Air quality

- Cumulative effects & mitigation

Ground Conditions

Policy EN7 of the Adopted Local Plan seeks to address existing contamination of land by appropriate mitigation measures to ensure the site is suitable for the proposed use and seeks to ensure that proposed development would not cause land to become contaminated.

Paragraph 178 of the Framework states planning decisions should ensure that the site is suitable for its new use taking account of ground conditions and land instability, including from natural hazards or former activities such as mining, pollution arising from previous uses and any proposals for mitigation including land remediation or impacts on the natural environment arising from that remediation. After remediation, as a minimum the land should not be capable of being determined as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990. Paragraph 179 goes on to state that where a site is affected by contamination or land stability issues, the responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer and/or landowner.

This chapter of the ES addresses the potential effects on ground conditions. The ES states in terms of human health, the main group that may be effected by the proposed development are construction workers. Although no areas of ground contamination have been identified, there may be potential sources of contamination that may exist as a result of the agricultural use of the site. The ES states that the worst case scenario would be the potential risk associated through skin contact, inhalation and ingestion of potential contaminants and inhalation of ground gas by workers involved in groundworks or earthworks. It is considered that the overall assessed risk would be 'Moderate'.

The ES states that the anticipated ground contamination is limited as a result of the site's geology and the low permeability glacial till, which would limit the vertical movement of contaminants into the groundwater. As such, the overall risk is considered to be 'Low'. In terms of surface water, there are existing water features, such as ponds and an aquifer within the site that may potentially be effected by the proposed development. There is an increased potential for contaminants to enter the surface water, which the ES considers would be a 'Low-Moderate'. The lack of environmentally sensitive areas on or within close proximity to the site is assessed as representing a 'Low' risk.

During the construction phase of the development, without mitigation the activities could potentially introduce new sources of contamination, through the use of building materials and contamination from soils associated with the agricultural use, farm and outbuildings. The ES states that the overall risk would be 'Low-Moderate'. As a result of the loss of agricultural land during the construction and operational phases of the development, the ES states that the substantial scale of change would have a major permanent effect, which has an assessed risk of 'High'.

During the operational phase of the development, without mitigation the proposed development could potentially impact upon human health, particularly site workers through unmitigated imported soils, site soils and ground gases. The ES states that the potential

risk would be assessed as 'Moderate'. The risk to groundwater and surface water through potential contamination is assessed as 'Low'. The risk to ecology and wildlife, based on the nature and distance of the site from any areas of environmental sensitivity and the low level of contamination anticipated onsite, in terms of the overall potential risk is assessed as 'Low'. The risk to ground contamination from imported materials and water supply pipes, together with contaminated soils from agricultural farming and a risk of explosion of ground gases, is assessed as 'Low-Moderate'.

The ES sets out a number of mitigation measures to be incorporated into the proposed development, which include a Construction Environmental Management Plan, which would include risk mitigation measures, provision of personal protective equipment, soil testing, the isolation and removal of any identified contamination sources, and the preservation of the integrity of topsoil for use as part of the proposed development. The loss of agricultural land is identified by the ES as being 'Moderate Adverse' due to the substantial change resulting from the proposed development. The proposed mitigation measures would result in the cumulative impacts upon human health, the environment and the development in regards to ground contamination being assessed as 'Negligible'.

Environmental Health has advised that the desk top study submitted with the application shows that there is potential for contamination due to made ground and gas as a result of the close proximity of a closed Landfill site and any infilled ponds. Therefore it is recommended that a condition be attached to any permission granted requiring the submission of a detailed site intrusive investigation, followed by a remediation statement and validation report if necessary. Subject to the requirements of this recommended condition being secured, Environmental Health raise no objection to the proposed development.

Conclusion on Ground Conditions

The proposed mitigation measures would result in the cumulative impacts upon human health, the environment and the development in regards to ground contamination being assessed as 'Negligible'. Subject to appropriate mitigation measures to prevent any adverse impacts during the construction and operational phases of development being secured prior to the commencement of development it is considered that the proposed development would accord with Local Plan Policies EN7 and the Framework.

Hydrology/Flood Risk, including drainage

Core Strategy Policy 29 seeks to improve water quality, water management and reduce the risk of flooding by number of measures including minimising the use of portable mains water in new developments; appraising, managing and reducing flood risk in new developments; managing the capacity and timing of development to avoid exceeding sewer infrastructure capacity; encouraging the adoption of Sustainable Drainage Systems; and seeking to maximise the potential of Green Infrastructure to contribute to flood relief.

Paragraph 163 of the Framework states that Local Planning Authorities should ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere (i.e. outside areas at risk of flooding) and only consider development appropriate in areas at risk of flooding where proposals are informed by a site-specific flood risk assessment.

This chapter of the ES considers the likely effects of the proposed development upon hydrology and flood risk including drainage and the likely significant effects on upon drainage and utilities, which could be created as a result of the proposed development, both during the construction and operational phases of the development.

The ES and the submitted Flood Risk Assessment and Preliminary Utilities Appraisal Report identify the existing constraints, utilities and drainage which are present on the application site. The site is identified primarily as within Flood Zone 1 with minor field drains which pass through the site. The submitted documents state that the majority of the site drains in a northerly direction to Woodplumpton Brook, which is located 1.2km to the north-east of the site. A small section of the site, located within the southern portion of the proposed development would drain to Savick Brook, which is located 1.5km to the south of the site. The application site contains an aquifer, which comprises of Sherwood Sandstone within the underlying bedrock geology and has a 'Principle' designation. This aquifer provides a high level of water storage and as a result the risk posed by groundwater is considered to be low.

The ES states that during the construction phase of development, without mitigation the proposed development could have a direct effect on the watercourse and water bodies adjacent to the site. Wastewater could also be generated from washing down lorries and mixing areas, which could result in particles running off the ground into waterbodies. The ES identifies that this impact would be 'Moderate Adverse'.

The ES identifies that oil, diesel and petrol are other common pollutants from construction sites, which without mitigation could pollute the water system and build-up on the surface of water, impacting water based ecosystems. The potential effect from this is considered to be a 'Moderate Adverse' risk. The ES states that any spillages has the potential to migrate downwards into the groundwater from where it would degrade groundwater quality and may potentially reach watercourses in the area and could have a 'Major adverse' impact.

In addition construction work could compact the ground which would cause short term disruption to the rate of infiltration. This could result in the reduction of groundwater and lowering the elevation of the water table. The ES states that given the 'Good' quantitative quality of groundwater, the impact would be anticipated to be 'Minor Adverse'. The magnitude of ground compaction leading to overland flows affecting on surrounding residential properties would be 'Moderate Adverse'.

During the operational phase of development, without mitigation the ES identifies that silts could be brought onto the site on vehicles, which could runoff. The level of sediment runoff is anticipated to be low and the potential effect considered 'Minor Adverse' over the long term to watercourses or proposed attenuation basis. The spillage of oil or diesel is identified in the ES to be mainly associated with heavy goods vehicles and general residential vehicles and activities that would be associated with the residential-led development. The effect of this is considered to be 'Major Adverse' through spillages into the watercourse. The ES also identifies that a reduction in infiltration due to the increase in impermeable area resulting from the proposed development could increase surface water runoff rates and volumes. These could be mitigated against through a detailed surface water drainage strategy and the effect would be 'Minor Beneficial'.

In order to address the effects that are identified as potential risk from the proposed development without mitigation, the ES sets out a number of mitigation measures. These include the submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan; good construction site practice; wheel washing of construction vehicles with designated areas at least 10m away from surface water bodies; provision of oil separators; no long-term storage of materials on-site; surface water drainage systems to be constructed as a priority as part of each phase of development; and the restriction of larger vehicle movements around the site to reduce soil compaction. During the operational phase of development, the ES proposes mitigation measures comprising the provision of oil/petrol interceptors to prevent accidental spillages from entering surface water drainage systems and a maintenance regime to be produced to reduce the risk of localised and downstream flooding. With the mitigation measures incorporated into the development, the predicted residual impact is assessed as 'Negligible'.

In terms of the potential cumulative impacts upon hydrology and flood risk, the ES identifies that the effects that would result from construction works and potential contamination of water supply in the area, disposal of wastewater, oil/fuel leaks from construction vehicles and equipment and disposal of hazardous materials would unlikely result in any cumulative impacts with other developments through the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures. As such, the effect is anticipated to be 'Negligible/Minor'. The proposed development would incorporate surface water drainage systems, designed in order to mitigate any cumulative impacts from additional surface water discharge relating to new built form and hardstanding associated with the residential development. Runoff from the site would also be restricted to greenfield rates which would assist in reducing flood risk. The ES also states that future water demands would be secured through consultation with United Utilities and no cumulative impacts are anticipated.

In their response to the application, United Utilities (UU) has raised no objection to the proposed development in principle and has advised that further detailed drainage proposals will be required to be submitted as part of any future reserved matters submission. Any proposals for wastewater assets for which the developer may seek UU adoption would be subject to a technical appraisal. In terms of water supply to the proposed development, UU advise that existing water mains may need to be extended to serve the development, which may require a developer contribution. This would be a private matter between the developer and UU and would not form part of any legal obligation with the Local Planning Authority.

United Utilities also advise that there are two significant large diameter trunk mains which cross the northern part of the site. UU state that these are critical assets for the supply of potable water within the immediate area and beyond and that they would not permit any building over, on or near to these assets. These mains will influence any future site layout of the residential-led development, subject to the outline application. Therefore, conditions are recommended to be attached to any permission granted requiring the submission of detailed drainage systems and their management and maintenance as part of any future reserved matters proposals. For the proposed roundabout junction proposal, subject to the full application, UU recommend a condition requiring the details of the means of ensuring

the existing water mains on site are protected from damage as part of the construction of the development.

In their response to the application, the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has raised no objection to the proposed development, subject to conditions being attached to the full and outline permission regarding sustainable drainage, surface water management, operation and maintenance, and verification report of constructed sustainable drainage system.

Conclusion on Hydrology/Flood Risk, including drainage

It is considered that the effects of the proposed development upon hydrology and flood risk would not be significant, subject to satisfactory mitigation. The proposed development would not result in any unacceptable impact upon the flood risk and drainage, subject to appropriate mitigation measures being secured and incorporated into the development. On this basis it is considered that the proposed development would accord with Core Strategy Policy 29 and the Framework.

Ecology

Policy 22 of the Core Strategy seeks to protect and find opportunities to enhance and manage the biological and geological assets of the area through certain measures, such as promoting the conservation and enhancement of biological diversity, having particular regard to the favourable condition, restoration and re-establishment of priority species and species populations; and seeking opportunities to conserve, enhance and expand ecological networks. Policy 17 seeks to ensure that all developments protect existing landscape features and natural assets, habitat creation and provide open space.

Policy EN10 of the Adopted Local Plan seeks to protect, conserve, restore and enhance biodiversity and ecological network resources in Preston. Policy EN11 states planning permission will not be granted for development which would have an adverse effect on a protected species unless the benefits of the development outweigh the need to maintain the population of the species in situ. Should development be permitted that might have an effect on a protected species planning conditions or obligation will be used to mitigate the impact.

Paragraph 170 of the Framework states that planning policies and decisions should, amongst other things, contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity. As well as recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, including trees and woodlands. Paragraph 175 of the Framework states that when determining applications, local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity by applying a number of principles. If significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated, or as a last resort compensated for, planning permission should be refused.

This chapter of the ES considers the likely significant effects of the proposed development on ecology and accesses the existing baseline ecological conditions at the application site and surroundings, the potential direct and indirect impacts of the proposal and set out mitigation measures. The ES is accompanied by the ecology and biodiversity studies and assessments:

- Preliminary Ecological appraisal (including bat scoping survey)

- Hedgerow assessment
- Great Crested Newts assessment and survey
- Breeding bird survey
- Ground level bat and barn owl tree assessment
- Bat activity survey
- Bat scoping survey
- Water vole and otter survey

In terms protected sites, the ES states that there are no statutorily protected sites within 2km of the proposed development, with 14 protected sites located with a 2-10km distance from the application site. The closest protected site is Newton Marsh Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), which is located 4.6km to the south-west. The Ribble & Alt Estuaries SSSI Special Protection Area and Ramsar site is located 5.1km to the south-west. The application site is therefore not located within the Impact Zone of statutorily protected sites.

There are five non-statutorily protected sites within 2km of the proposed development, which are all designated Biological Heritage Sites (BHS). Of these, Bartle Wetlands is located within the application site and covers neighbouring land between the site and the M55 motorway. Within the application site, the ES identifies a mixture of habitats, together with protected or notable species, which include:

- Amphibians – Great Crested Newts, common toads, common frog, smooth newt and palmate newt;
- Bats – Daubenton's bat, noctule bat, common pipistrelle, and brown-eared bat;
- Birds – Various species;
- Reptiles – slow worm;
- Other mammals – brown hare, hedgehog, European otter and American mink.

The ES and ecology and biodiversity assessments identify 1 no pond on site which supports Great Crested Newt. The site also supports common toad, common frog and suitable breeding, foraging, sheltering and hibernation opportunities. The majority of the site comprises poor quality reptile habitat and relatively low records of reptiles. Although no badgers were recorded by the surveys, the site does have suitable foraging, sheltering and sett-excavating opportunities. Within the Bartle Wetlands, 5no species of bat were observed. The ES states that the site provides habitat opportunities for nesting birds and areas of dense scrub, woodland, hedgerows, ponds, swamp and marginal habitats are present. In addition, there is also limited suitability for overwintering waterfowl, improved grassland and associated aquatic habitats.

The ES sets out that during the construction phase of development, without mitigation the proposed development could have a direct effect upon ecological receptors through land take, vegetation removal, material storage, excavations, soil movements or grounds works and the use of vehicles, machinery and plant. The ES states that the land within Bartle Wetlands BHS would be unaffected by the proposed development, however the proposed development working areas lie immediately adjacent to the Bartle Wetlands BHS and construction works could result in the pollution and disturbance of the aquatic habitats. This

is considered to be a high magnitude impact at a local level, which would be classed as 'Moderate Significance'.

The removal of trees and hedgerows would result in permanent damage as an ecological resource, which the ES identifies to be of medium magnitude and therefore considered to be 'Minor Significance'. The proposed development would result in the loss of 0.27ha of woodland and individual trees could be impacted by construction activities upon the root systems of retained trees, which the ES identifies to be of medium magnitude and therefore considered to be 'Minor Significance'.

All ponds are proposed to be retained and the ES identifies that without mitigation, the proposed development could result in pollution and disturbance to these ponds, which is considered to be a high magnitude impact, which would be of 'Moderate Significance'. In addition Amphibians could potentially be at direct risk of harm through construction works, together with suitable habitats, which is identified as being of 'Moderate Significance'.

In terms of nesting birds, the proposed construction works could result in a direct loss of nests and available territories during the breeding season, which the ES identifies as a high magnitude impact of 'Minor Significance'. The development could also result in the loss of foraging and breeding habitats for a number of bird species, which would have a medium magnitude impact, which the ES identifies as 'Minor Significance'.

The loss of improved grassland and field margin habitats in use by brown hares and hedgehogs is considered by the ES to be a low magnitude impact and therefore of 'Minor Significance'. The removal of vegetation and site clearance, which provide sheltering areas for hedgehogs is considered to represent a medium magnitude impact which is of 'Minor Significance'.

During the operational phase of development, without mitigation the ES identifies that the proposed development could give rise to ecological impacts including lighting and inappropriate landscape management. New residents of the development have the potential to visit the Ribble & Alt Estuaries SPA and Ramsar site, which could result in increased recreational pressures, potentially resulting in severe adverse impacts upon wetland bird species and the designated use of the SPA and Ramsar site. This is identified by the ES as a having a potential 'medium magnitude impact at European level, which is considered to be of 'Critical Significance'.

In addition, roadside gully pots could trap amphibians and cause potential death without means of escape, which is identified as a high magnitude impact at site level therefore of 'Minor Significance'. Inappropriate lighting could affect light-sensitive bats from foraging, commuting or roosting on parts of the site, which is identified as a medium magnitude impact and therefore of 'Minor Significance'. The ES also identifies that the loss of improved grassland and field margin habitats in use by the low number of hedgehogs, could be replaced by residential gardens and amenity gardens/open space that would still support hedgehog populations. If no gaps or access points are provided by boundary fences, this could create isolated areas and impact upon hedgehog movements, which is considered to represent a low magnitude impact of 'Minor Significance'.

In order to address the effects that are identified as potential risk from the proposed development without mitigation, the ES sets out a number of mitigation measures. During the construction phase of development, the mitigation measures include pollution prevention measures in accordance with Environment Agency guidance. Ecological features that are proposed to be removed will be compensated through the planting of native hedgerows; root protection areas would be installed around retained trees and hedgerows, together with woodland protection. Additional Great Crested Newt and bat surveys shall be undertaken and mitigation measures implemented prior to works commencing on site. Bat and bird boxes would be installed and external light spillage would be minimised. Site clearance and vegetation removal would not be undertaken during the breeding bird season (March to August) and avoidance measures to mitigate against the impact upon hedgehogs and hares would be implemented including escape excavations, supervised vegetation clearance and site vehicle speed limits.

During the operational phase of the development, the ES sets out mitigation measures including homeowner information packs to be provided to all new residents to inform them of the presence and importance of the European sites; a Landscape Ecological Management Plan will be produced for reserved matters applications; and the implementation of good horticultural practice will be promoted within landscaping schemes. In addition waste and recycling facilities would be provided in areas surrounding ponds and mesh coverings would be installed to gully pots to prevent amphibians falling in. Lighting schemes would be designed to minimise light spillage on areas with bat usage potential.

The ES states that with the inclusion of the proposed ecological mitigation measures, the residual impacts of the proposed development would be 'Neutral, Minor Positive or Moderate Positive'. There would still be a potential impact upon brown hares based on the amount of habitat loss and dispersal, which would be unavoidable and considered to be a 'Minor Negative' impact. However the ES identifies that the surrounding area presents a large amount of similar suitable habitats which would result in a minor impact.

Natural England has advised that the proposed development could have potential significant effects on the Ribble and Alt Estuaries Special Protection Area (SPA), the Ribble and Estuaries Ramsar Site and Newton Marsh Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). In order to determine the significance of these impacts a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) will be required. The Local Planning Authority's ecology advisers have prepared a HRA, which Natural England has advised that the HRA concludes that the proposed development would not result in adverse effects on the integrity of any sites identified. Natural England concurs with assessment and recommended mitigation measures. The mitigation measures would include the provision of the agreed quantum of on-site public open space provision to be included in any future reserved matters applications; the provision of countryside furniture, pathway marking and interpretative panels within the site and links to the Public Rights of Way network adjacent to the site; and Homeowners packs to be provided as the phases of the development come forward which shall include guidance of responsible behaviour in the vicinity of the development, public rights of way, details of facilities and key species within the area. These mitigation measures can be secured by condition.

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (GMEU) has raised no objection in principle, subject to conditions being attached to both the full and outline proposal should permission be granted. GMEU advise that the application site is not functionally linked to the Ribble & Alt Estuaries SPA and a Habitats Regulation Assessment is being undertaken and further comments will be provided. Issues relating to bats, other protected, species, priority species, nesting birds and invasive species can be resolved by conditions and or informatives for the outline proposals. In terms of potential recreational disturbance to the Ribble & Alt Estuaries SPA, GMEU recommended that homeowners information packs are provided to future residents of the development. The ES has stated that this would be provided.

The Bartle Wetlands BHS and other ponds and watercourses are proposed to be retained and will require protection during construction works. GMEU has therefore recommended that these protection measures and a wider Construction and Environmental Management Plan are secured by condition for the outline proposals. In addition, Great Crested Newts have been found in three ponds on the site. Pond 9 is set to the east of Bartle Hall, with the other two ponds proposed to be removed under license as part of the PWDR construction. Pond 9 is to be retained as part of the proposed development and as such, GMEU recommend that an updated Great Crested Newt survey and any required mitigation measures are provided as part of any future reserved matters application.

GMEU advise that buildings and trees on site have bat roosting potential. The submitted surveys were undertaken in 2018 and recorded the highest level of activity along boundary features around the wetlands. Any future reserved matters submission will therefore be required to include updated bat surveys. The creation of bat roosts as part of any mitigation measures, could also provide biodiversity enhancements on the site through the inclusion of bat bricks within new buildings and bat boxes within retained trees and adjacent woodland to support foraging habitat.

In relation to nesting birds, GMEU advise that the proposed development would result in the loss of trees and hedgerows, which provide potential bird nesting habitat. As such, it is recommended that no works to trees or shrubs is undertaken during the bird nesting season (1st March – 31st August), which can be controlled by condition. No other protected species have been found on the site and therefore in the event of any potential re-colonisation during the intervening period before development is commenced, it is recommended that updated surveys for badgers, water vole and otter or any other protected species is undertaken and any subsequently required mitigation measures secured, which can also be secured by condition. Hedgehogs and brown hares are likely to be impacted upon by the development, and GMEU advise that subject to suitable reasonable avoidance measures being implemented during the construction phase of the development and mitigation during the operation phase, no adverse impacts would be created.

GMEU state that invasive species including Himalayan balsam, giant hogweed and rhododendron have been recorded on the site and as such any future reserved matters proposals would be required to provide a method statement for the eradication, control and avoidance measures for invasive species to be eradicated. This would also be required for the full application proposal, which can be secured by condition.

As set out above, there is a requirement under Paragraph 170 of the Framework for the proposed development to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity. GMEU advise that as part of pre-application discussions they have held, the proposal aims to provide 13% of the site to be allocated for ecological mitigations. As the residential-led proposal is in outline, the precise details of how biodiversity net gain would be provided has not been established and would come forward through future reserved matters applications. Therefore, in order to ensure a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain is secured through future proposals, GMEU recommend that a landscape and environmental management plan is provided within reserved matters proposals and shall include:

- 10% biodiversity net gain for both area based and linear habitats;
- Details of habitats to be created;
- Mitigation for the loss of hedgehog habitats;
- Bird and bat boxes and bricks;
- Great Crested Newts mitigation strategy for Pond 9;
- Management plan for the maintenance and enhancement of Bartle Wetlands BHS;
- 10 year management plan; and
- Details of organisation(s) responsible for managing and maintenance.

Subject to the above conditions, GMEU raised no objection to the proposed development.

The Environment Agency, raise no objection to the proposed development and advise that the proposal for major greenfield development has the potential to result in significant impacts on a range of habitats. As such, it is recommended that the development incorporates opportunities to secure biodiversity net gain in accordance with national policy guidance. Therefore a Landscape and Environment Management Plan should be submitted as reserved matters stage.

Conclusions on Ecology

It is considered that any effects resulting from the proposed development upon ecology would not be significant with appropriate mitigation measures being secured. Ecology advisers Natural England, GMEU and the Environment Agency have raised no objection to the proposed development, subject to conditions being attached to any planning permission being granted. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would not result in any unacceptable impact upon the ecology and appropriate mitigation measures could be secured and incorporated into the development. On this basis it is considered that the proposed development would accord with Core Strategy Policies 17 and 22, Local Plan Policies EN10 and EN11 and the Framework.

Transportation

Core Strategy Policy 2 states that the Local Planning Authority will work with infrastructure providers to establish works that will arise from or be made worse by development proposals. It further states that the Local Planning Authority will set broad priorities on the provision of the infrastructure to ensure that it is delivered in line with future growth. Core Strategy Policy 3 outlines a number of measures which are considered to constitute the best approach to planning for travel. These include reducing the need to travel, improving pedestrian facilities, improving opportunities for cycling, improving public transport, enabling travellers to change their mode of travel on trips, encouraging car sharing, managing car use and improving the road network.

Policy ST2 of the Adopted Local Plan requires development proposals to demonstrate that the efficient and convenient movement of all highway users and corridors which could be developed as future transport routes are not prejudiced, that existing pedestrian, cycle and equestrian routes are protected and extended; the needs of disabled people are fully provided for; appropriate provision is made for vehicular access, off-street servicing, vehicle parking and public transport services; and that appropriate measures are included for road safety and to facilitate access on foot and by bicycle. Adopted Local Plan Policy ST1 requires new development proposals to provide car parking and servicing space in accordance with the parking standards contained within the Appendix B to the Adopted Local Plan.

Paragraph 109 of the Framework states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

This chapter of the ES considers the impact of the proposed development upon transportation. Matters pertaining to traffic and highway safety have been considered in more detail earlier in the report. In environmental terms, the ES states that during the construction of the development, without mitigation the proposed development would result in an increase in traffic through construction traffic using local roads, delivery vehicles and staff movements. The ES estimates for each construction phase of development, it is anticipated that there would be 50 on-site members of staff, which would generate 80 car borne trips per day and seven HGV deliveries. The ES states that this would result in a 'Negligible Adverse' impact on the highway network. In addition, there is potential for mud and debris to be deposited on the local road network from construction vehicles, which could have 'Slight Adverse' impact. The ES identifies that the construction phase of the development could obstruct existing footways, cycle ways, and public rights of way. It is considered that this would be a temporary effect which would have a 'Slight Adverse' impact.

During the operational phase of the development, the ES and accompanying transport assessment states that the proposed development would generate a total of 5,266 vehicle trips per day, of which 37 would be HGVs. The ES identifies that without mitigation, the level of impact on the local highway network cannot be fully assessed at this time. The reason for this is that the proposed development would incorporate a new access to the PWDR which is currently under construction. As such, existing and forecasted traffic movement would change as a result of the PWDR infrastructure. The ES proposes that following completion of the PWDR, the impact of the proposed development during the operational phase of development would be assessed through an ES addendum.

In order to address the effects that are identified as potential risks as result of the proposed development without mitigation, the ES sets out a number of mitigation measures. These include the submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan for each construction phase of the development. During the operational phase, the ES sets out that the proposed development would provide additional road access to the local road network off Rosemary Lane, Lea Lane, Bartle Lane and Blackleach Lane and new footways would be installed connecting to the existing network. The development would provide the re-routing of the no.74 bus service and the internal layout of the development would

incorporate the route. Speed limits to the surrounding road network would be reduced and increased pedestrian and cycle demand would be generated. A Travel Plan in line with the Framework Travel Plan would be produced for the outline application areas of development.

In considering the proposed mitigation measures the ES states that the residual impact from the construction phase of the development upon transportation would be 'Not Significant' and the operational phase would be determined through an ES addendum.

The ES identifies that cumulative impacts upon transportation may arise from the proposed development in combination with the construction activities of other development sites within the wider area. It is considered that these impacts would be mitigated through the implementation of a construction traffic management plan, which would result in a 'Negligible' impact. During the operational phase, the number of new dwellings and commercial/school development would result in a significant increase in traffic, which could become more significant when considered cumulatively. The ES states that with the proposed mitigation, including improvements to public transport, walking and cycling routes, this would result in a 'Moderate' impact. The ES therefore concludes that the proposed mitigation measures for the construction phase of development and those to be incorporated into the operational phase would ensure that the impacts are reduced to as low as reasonably practical and to acceptable levels.

County Highways and Highways England have provided comments on the proposed development, which is considered in the Traffic and Highway Safety section above. County Highways consider that the proposed roundabout junction is acceptable and that subject to details and commitments being secured for the residential-led outline proposals, the proposed development would not result in severe impacts upon the local highway network. Highways England advise that subject to conditions, the proposed development would not have any severe impacts upon the M55 motorway. It is considered that subject to satisfactory details and commitments being secured, the proposed development would accord with Core Strategy Policies 2 and 3, Local Plan Policy ST2 and the Framework. Parking provision required under Local Plan Policy ST1 would be established at reserved matters stage.

Conclusion of Transportation

In conclusion, it is considered that subject to the details and commitments being secured for the outline development areas in relation to safe and suitable access for all road users and the provision of pedestrian and cycle movement priorities, together with the public transport commitments, the proposed development would not result in any severe impacts upon the local and strategic highway network. On this basis, the proposed mitigation measures the potential effects of the proposed development would not be significant with the proposed mitigation. Therefore the proposed development would comply with Core Strategy Policies 2 and 3, Local Plan Policy ST2 and the Framework.

Noise

Policy 17 of the Core Strategy and Policy EN9 of the Adopted Local Plan state that the design of new buildings will be expected to take account of the character and appearance of the local area, being sympathetic to surrounding land uses and occupiers and avoiding

demonstrable harm to the amenities of the local area. Policy AD1(a) of the Adopted Local Plan requires, amongst other things, that the development has no adverse impact on residential amenity. The Framework seeks to ensure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

This chapter of the ES addresses the potential effects on noise that existing and proposed receptors would experience as a result of the proposed development, both during the construction and operational phases of the development. Existing residential properties are located adjacent to the application site boundary on Bartle Lane, Blackleach Lane and Lea Lane. The submitted noise survey states that the existing ambient noise levels around the site are dominated by road traffic noise from the M55 motorway, which is located to the north of the proposed development. Noise is also audible from Rosemary Lane, Lea Lane, Blackheath Lane and Bartle Lane.

The ES states that during the construction phase the estimated noise created by the proposed development without mitigation would result in 'Less than Minor' and therefore 'Not Significant' level upon identified receptors. During the operational phase of the proposed development, the ES states that the estimated noise level would result from the predicted change in traffic noise (no more than 0.5dB(A)). This impact is considered to be 'Negligible' and therefore 'Not Significant' upon identified receptors. Therefore, the ES states that no mitigation measures would be required.

The ES states that for the proposed dwellings within the development, the recommended World Health Organisation internal noise levels would be generally exceeded across the site during the daytime and night-time, immediately adjacent to the M55 motorway, PWDR, Rosemary Lane, Lea Lane and Bartle Lane. The magnitude of impact is assessed by the ES as being 'Major' and therefore the effect would be 'Significant' without any mitigation. Therefore, the ES sets out a number of mitigation measures that would be included within the proposed development, which includes the installation of sound reduction glazing and alternative ventilation, together with double glazing. The layout of the development would also be designed to minimise the potential impact through the appropriate positioning of living rooms, bedrooms and gardens. The proposed mitigation measures could be secured by condition, with the layout of the development to be established at reserved matters stage.

Environmental Health has raised no objection to the proposed development in terms of potential impacts upon noise, subject to conditions being attached to any permission granted that require the submission of noise studies for each phase of the reserved matters submissions, both for the residential and small scale local facilities.

Conclusion on Noise

It is considered that the effects of the proposed development would not result in any unacceptable noise impact to the existing neighbouring properties or the future occupants of the development, subject to appropriate mitigation measures being incorporated into the development. On this basis it is considered that the proposed development would accord with Core Strategy Policy 17 and Local Plan Policies EN9 and AD1(a) and the Framework.

Air Quality

Policy 30 of the Core Strategy seeks to improve air quality through delivery of Green

Infrastructure initiatives and through taking account of air quality when prioritising measures to reduce road traffic congestion. Policy 3 of the Core Strategy seeks to encourage the use of alternative fuels for transport purposes.

Paragraph 124 of the Framework states that planning policies should sustain compliance with and contribute towards EU limit values or national objectives for pollutants, taking into account the presence of Air Quality Management Areas and the cumulative impacts on air quality from individual sites in local areas. Planning decisions should ensure that any new development in Air Quality Management Areas is consistent with the local air quality action plan.

This chapter of the ES addresses the potential effects on the quality of air that existing and proposed receptors would experience as a result of the proposed development, both during the construction and operational phases of the development. The application site is not within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA), with the closest located 3.6km from the site at Broughton Crossroads. The ES states that during the construction phase, the proposed development would give rise to potential dust nuisance and surface deposits and therefore without mitigation the proposal would have a 'Substantial' effect upon the surrounding area. During the operational phase of the development, the ES states that the proposal would generate additional traffic and would result in additional exhaust emissions being generated on local and regional roads. The ES considers that without mitigation, the potential impact is predicted to be 'Negligible' at the existing residential sensitive receptor locations.

The ES sets out mitigation measures to be incorporated during the construction phase of the proposed development to mitigate dust emissions through monitoring and testing which would be included within the Construction Environmental Management Plan. The ES concludes that with these measures the level of impact upon air quality would be reduced to 'Negligible'. During the operational phase of the development, the ES recommends that a Travel Plan should be prepared to include good practice measures to promote sustainable travel and reduce the associated vehicle emissions. This would ensure that the potential impact of the operational phase of the development would remain 'Negligible'. The ES states that with these mitigation measures, the operational phase of the development would have a residual 'Beneficial' effect on local pollutant levels.

Environmental Health has raised no objection to the proposed development in terms of air quality, subject to air quality mitigation measures set out in the ES being secured. It is also recommended that the proposed development should be designed to incorporate cycle and pedestrian friendly roads, including any cycle storage infrastructure at the local centre. The need for electric vehicle charging points for each dwelling in support of the Council's commitment to the Climate Change Emergency Declaration and the need for a Travel Plan to be approved by the local planning authority is recommended. Environmental Health therefore, request conditions to be attached to any permission granted that requires the submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan. Details of the Travel Plan and electric vehicle charging points to be provided for each dwelling and cycle storage for the local centre can also be secured by conditions.

Conclusions on Air Quality

It is considered that the effects of the proposed development would not result in any unacceptable impact upon the air quality, subject to appropriate mitigation measures being incorporated into the development. On this basis it is considered that the proposed development would accord with Core Strategy Policies 3 and 30 and the Framework.

Cumulative Effects & Mitigation

In addition to the above chapters the ES considers the cumulative effects that may arise from the combination of the proposed development, together with the existing and foreseeable developments (inter-project effects) within the vicinity of the application site. The ES identifies major development proposals within the vicinity, which are located within the North West Preston Strategic Location and Cottam Strategic Site, together with sites at Ingol Golf Course and land at Dodney Drive. The ES states that the cumulative impacts will not be transferrable to all topics as a result of the nature of the proposed development, the site, location and potential impacts.

The ES sets out the potential cumulative impacts for each topic as follows:

ES Topic	Construction Phase	Operational Phase
Ground Conditions	Negligible/Minor	Not anticipated
Hydrology/Flood Risk	Negligible/Minor	Minor
Ecology	Negligible	Negligible
Transportation	Negligible	Moderate
Air Quality	Negligible/Minor	Negligible/Minor
Noise	Negligible	Negligible/Minor

The ES states that the mitigation as proposed for each topic satisfactorily addresses the interactions and cumulative impacts of the proposed development. Therefore, no cumulative effects are considered to be incapable of mitigation.

Planning Obligations

Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) and paragraph 56 of the Framework state that a planning obligation may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission for the development if the obligation is:

- a) Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- b) Directly related to the development; and
- c) Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

As part of the proposed development, financial contributions together with on-site provision and facilities would be secured through a planning obligation to be attached to any permission granted. The obligation would secure affordable housing through a mix of on-site provision and financial contribution towards off-site affordable housing in Preston; open spaces and sports provision within the development; the management and maintenance of amenity greenspace areas, bus service routing and service frequency within the residential-led development; and land for the future provision of a primary school. The land required for the primary school would be determined following the detailed design of the development and the timing of delivery. As County Education has advised that any future

re-assessment could potentially result in the land not being required or reduced in size, the obligation would secure a clause that allows for the redistribution of commuted sums towards commitments within the obligation where full provision has not been able to be achieved at this stage. The obligation would include a clause that would provide for the future re-appraisal of the development at the detailed design stage and for the Council to re-distribute monies towards commitments and contributions within the development. The obligations meet the tests set out in Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended).

Tilted Balance

The assessment as to whether it is appropriate to engage the tilted balance in Paragraph 11(d) of the Framework is comprised of three stages. Firstly, the most important policies for determining the application must be identified. Secondly, those policies must be assessed to ascertain whether or not they are out-of-date. Thirdly the basket of policies must be looked at to determine if, in the round, it is out-of-date thereby engaging the tilted balance.

The most important policies for determining this planning application are considered to be:

Central Lancashire Core Strategy

Policy 1: Locating Growth

Policy 2: Infrastructure

Policy 4: Housing Delivery

Preston Local Plan 2012-2026 (Site Allocations & Development Management Policies)

Policy EN1: Development in the Open Countryside

Policy IN1: Western Distributor

Core Strategy Policy 1 and Policy EN1 are relevant to the principle of the development proposed. Policy 4 is housing-related and contains the housing requirement figure for Central Lancashire. It has been stated earlier in this report that Core Strategy Policy 4 is out of date. However, whilst the minimum housing requirement of Policy 4 is out-of-date, it does not follow that the other most important policies for determining the application are out-of-date. Core Strategy Policy 2 and Local Plan Policy IN1 are relevant to the principle of the development proposed as they relate to the delivery of infrastructure and the PWDR. Core Strategy Policy 2 and Local Plan Policy IN1 are not housing-related policies and are therefore not out-of-date.

Core Strategy Policy 1 promotes the spatial strategy for growth across Central Lancashire. For Preston this means focussing growth and investment in the main urban area (comprising of the Central Preston Strategic Location and adjacent inner city suburbs), the Cottam Strategic Site, the North West Preston Strategic Location and the Key Service Centre of Longridge. Policy 1 does not unreasonably constrain the ability of Preston to accommodate its local housing need calculated by way of the standard methodology. Policy 1 is therefore not out-of-date.

Policy EN1 restricts development which takes place in the open countryside to that needed for the purposes of agriculture and forestry (or other rural appropriate uses), the re-use of existing buildings and infill within groups of buildings, as well as development permissible in other policies contained within the Local Plan (namely Policies HS4 and HS5). Given the local housing need in Preston (250 net additional homes per annum) is currently

substantially below the housing requirement contained in Policy 4 (507 net additional homes per annum), it is clear that more than sufficient land has been allocated in the current Local Plan to meet the local housing need. Policy EN1 does not unreasonably constrain the ability of Preston to accommodate its local housing need calculated by way of the standard methodology. As a consequence, the rural settlement boundaries do not need to be reconsidered at this time and remain relevant and up-to-date. Policy EN1 is therefore not out-of-date.

Core Strategy Policy 2 encourages developers to work with service providers to establish works and/or service requirements that will arise from or be made worse by development proposals and determine what could be met through developer contributions. It seeks to ensure, through developer contributions, that new development meets the on and off-site infrastructure requirements necessary to support development and mitigate any impact of that development on existing community interests. Core Strategy Policy 2 does not conflict with the Framework is therefore not out-of-date.

Local Plan Policy IN1 seeks to safeguard the preferred route for the Preston Western Distributor Road in the location shown on the Policies Map. It states planning permission will not be granted for any development that would prejudice the construction of the road. Local Plan Policy IN1 does not conflict with the Framework is therefore not out-of-date.

Accordingly four of the five most important policies for determining the application are up to date. As only one of the most important policies is out of date, the basket of policies most important for determining the application, in the round, is not out-of-date and the tilted balance is not engaged.

3.7 Value Added to the Development

The proposal has been subject to pre-application advice and discussions during submission.

3.8 Conclusions

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that if regard is to be had to the Development Plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the Planning Acts the determination must be in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The application site is located in the open countryside as shown on the policies map of the Preston Local Plan 2012-2026 (Site Allocations and Development Management Policies). The proposed development would be contrary to the hierarchy of locations for focussing growth and investment at urban, brownfield, allocated sites, sites within key service centres and other defined places, contrary to Core Strategy Policy 1. The proposed development is not the type of development deemed permissible under Local Plan Policy EN1 and the loss of open countryside for the development proposed is therefore contrary to this policy. However the proposed development would not conflict with Policies 11 and 31 of the Adopted Core Strategy and Policies IN1 and EP4 of the adopted Preston Local Plan.

Paragraph 12 of the Framework states where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan permission should not usually be granted. It further states local planning authorities may take decisions that depart from an up-to-date development plan,

but only if material considerations in a particular case indicate that the plan should not be followed.

Policy 4 of the Core Strategy seeks to deliver a total of 22,158 new dwellings across the three Central Lancashire districts during the plan period of 2010-2026. However, the Council is using the standard methodology to calculate its local housing need figure and considers the housing requirement contained within Policy 4 is out-of-date. It should be remembered at this point, however, that at the recent Cardwell Farm Inquiry the Inspector disagreed with the Council and found the housing requirement within Policy 4 to be up to date and accepted the Council could only demonstrate 4.95 years of deliverable housing land against the housing requirement in Policy 4. The Council is proposing to challenge this decision as the Council considers the Inspector erred in coming to his conclusion.

At April 2020 the Council's local housing need figure calculated using the standard methodology is 250 dwellings per annum. Against this figure, the Council can currently demonstrate a 13.6 year supply of deliverable housing land.

The most important policies for determining this application, Policies 1, 2 and 4 of the Core Strategy and Policies EN1 and IN1 of the Local Plan, accord with the Framework, save for Core Strategy Policy 4 which, as mentioned above, is considered to be out of date. As only one of the most important policies is out of date, the basket of policies most important for determining the application, in the round, is not out-of-date and the tilted balance is not engaged.

In this case, two of the five most important policies for determining this application, Core Strategy Policy 1 and Local Plan Policy EN1 indicate that the proposed development should be refused. These policies are up to date and carry significant weight in the determination of the planning application. Indeed members have in the last twelve months or more been recommended to refuse planning applications that are contrary to these up to date policies. However there are material considerations in this case that weigh heavily in favour of the application. As stated above, paragraph 12 of the Framework endorses the statutory status of the development plan but states that local planning authorities may take decisions that depart from an up to date development plan, but only if material considerations in a particular case indicate that the plan should not be followed. The analysis above states that the PWDR would run through the centre of the application site, linking the M55 motorway to the A583/A584 at Clifton. The PWDR is scheduled to open in Spring 2023 and it would fundamentally change the character of the open countryside in this area of Preston. The development of this significant infrastructure project will inevitably result in irreversible, significant changes to the role, function, purpose and appearance of the open countryside in this part of Preston, to the extent that it will lose its open and rural character. Given this and the application site's location, adjacent to the north boundary of the North West Preston Strategic Location, a significant factor in the determination of this application, in the context of the review of the Local Plan, is the extent to which the proposed development can be considered as a sustainable urban extension to Preston. Furthermore, whilst the Council can demonstrate a 13.6 year housing land supply using the standard method and so the tilted balance is not engaged, the standard method produces a minimum figure (for Preston the figure is 250 dwellings per annum). Whilst this is the Council's starting point to determine the number of homes needed within the district, in order to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of new

homes, set out in paragraph 50 the Framework, and the Council's commitments under City Deal, it is considered there would be considerable merit in approving this proposal for new housing in this urban fringe location, which can be considered as a sustainable urban extension to Preston and would not be harmful to the role, function, purpose and appearance of the open countryside in this part of Preston. Furthermore the application would deliver in the region of 200no. dwellings in the early phase of development, which alone could essentially contribute to almost a years' supply against the current local housing need figure of 250 dwellings. These material considerations can be given significant weight in the planning balance and set this proposal apart from other proposals that the Council has considered recently on land adjacent to but outside of rural, village boundaries. The proposed development would also provide additional benefits through the provision of affordable housing, financial contributions towards public transport, sports provision and education, together with a school site within the application site. These benefits can be given moderate beneficial weight.

The proposed development complies with Core Strategy Policy 2 and Local Plan Policy IN1, which both support the delivery of infrastructure. Granting planning permission for the proposed roundabout before the end of April 2021 would have the added benefit of enabling the roundabout to be constructed as part of the on-going works to the PWDR, which would comply with economic objective of achieving sustainable development set out in the Framework by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure. If the proposed roundabout is not constructed in the coming months of this year the opportunity to synchronise the delivery of the new roundabout as part of the on-going PWDR construction will be missed and would create severe traffic disruption and substantially increase costs to the applicant, which should be avoided in the interests of achieving sustainable development. The proposed development would provide policy compliant affordable housing provision, education provision and land for a primary school, financial contributions towards public transport and sports provision. It is considered that in these circumstances, taken as a whole, these material considerations and those set out in the preceding paragraph attract significant weight in the flat planning balance. Additionally, special regard to the preservation of the setting of one identified designated heritage asset, Anderton House, has been given as required by the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the less than substantial harm to Anderton House would be outweighed by public benefits as a result of the development

Notwithstanding the above, there are adverse impacts of the application, as well as the conflict with the development plan that must be taken into consideration. The proposed development would result in some environmental harm, which has been assessed through the submitted Environmental Statement (ES), however the ES has identified the potential areas of harm and proposes suitable mitigation and compensation measures. The adverse impacts of the application do not attract significant weight in isolation, however when added to the weight of the conflict with the development plan, they add greater weight to the reasons why the application should be refused.

The proposed development conflicts with Core Strategy Policy 1 and Local Plan Policy EN1. These policies are up to date and carry significant weight in the determination of the planning application in accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The conflict with these policies suggests that the starting point is the

proposed development should be refused. In terms of the environmental harm identified in the ES, this can be mitigated and compensation measures would also be delivered.

On the other hand, the proposed development complies Core Strategy Policy 2 and Local Plan Policy IN1 and these policies are up to date. Also weighing in favour of the application is its location adjacent to the PWDR and to the north boundary of the North West Preston Strategic Location, which in the context of the review of the Local Plan, can be considered as a sustainable urban extension to Preston. Furthermore the proposal would support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of new homes, set out in paragraph 50 the Framework and the Council's commitments under City Deal. In addition, there is merit in approving this proposal for new housing in this urban fringe location, which can be considered as a sustainable urban extension to Preston and would not be harmful to the role, function, purpose and appearance of the open countryside in this part of Preston. Granting planning permission for the proposed roundabout before the end of April 2021 would enable the roundabout to be constructed as part of the on-going works to the PWDR, which would comply with economic objective of achieving sustainable development set out in the Framework by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure. If the proposed roundabout is not constructed in the coming months of this year the opportunity to synchronise the delivery of the new roundabout as part of the on-going PWDR construction will be missed and would create severe traffic disruption and substantially increase costs to the applicant, which should be avoided in the interests of achieving sustainable development. Special regard to the preservation of the setting of one identified designated heritage asset has been given as required by the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the less than substantial harm to Anderton House would be outweighed by public benefits as a result of the development. The proposed development would also provide additional benefits through the provision of affordable housing, financial contributions towards public transport, sports provision and education, together with a school site within the application site. Development works would commence in the coming months in Summer 2021 with the implementation of the roundabout junction, which in turn would allow the applicant to bring forward the first phase of development, which would deliver in the region of 200no. dwellings and make a significant contribution to the Council's five year housing land supply.

In carrying out the planning balance and weighing up the adverse impacts of the application against the benefits that weigh in favour of the application, in the circumstances specific to this application, it is considered the material considerations in favour of the application tip the balance in favour of approving the application and in accordance with section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, planning permission should be granted.

3.9 Recommendation

1. Subject to a Section 106 Obligation being secured providing education provision and land, open space and sports provision, management and maintenance of areas of amenity greenspace on-site, Travel Plan and co-ordinator, bus service routing and service frequency, and option for the off-site provision of affordable housing planning permission be granted subject to conditions addressing those matters listed in paragraph 2.1.

And

2. In the event that a satisfactory Section 106 Obligation is not concluded by 16th April 2021, or other agreed extension of time, delegate authority to the Director of Development to refuse planning permission on the grounds that the obligations which make the development acceptable have not been legally secured.