

## **Lancashire County Council**

### **Development Control Committee**

**Minutes of the Virtual Meeting held on Wednesday, 21st April, 2021 at 10.30 am**

**Present:**

County Councillor Barrie Yates (Chair)

#### **County Councillors**

S Clarke	P Hayhurst
C Crompton	A Kay
M Dad	M Pattison
J Eaton BEM	P Rigby
K Ellard	C Towneley
D Foxcroft	

**1. Apologies for absence**

None received.

**2. Disclosure of Pecuniary and Non-Pecuniary Interests**

County Councillor Clarke declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 7 as a member of the NW Regional Flood and Coastal Committee.

County Councillor Yates also declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 7 as the local Member for an area affected by the development.

**3. Minutes of the last meeting held on 3 March 2021**

**Resolved:** That the Minutes of the last meeting held on 3 March 2021 be confirmed as a correct record of the meeting.

**4. Update Sheet**

The Update Sheet was circulated prior to the meeting and attached as a supplementary agenda item.

**5. Ribble Valley Borough: application number. LCC/2020/0075  
Construction of four no. kiosks and widening / modifications to  
existing access road (in connection with other improvements to  
existing waste water treatment works to be carried out under  
permitted development rights).  
Wilpshire Waste Water Treatment Works, Ribchester Road, Clayton  
le Dale.**

A report was presented on an application for the construction of four kiosks and widening / modifications to the existing access road (in connection with other improvements to existing waste water treatment works to be carried out under permitted development rights) at Wilpshire Waste Water Treatment Works, Ribchester Road, Clayton le Dale.

The report included the views of Ribble Valley Borough Council, Clayton-le-Dale Parish Council, LCC Ecology Service, the Environment Agency, LCC Highways Development Control and details of six letters of representation received comprising four objections and two letters of support.

The Development Management Officer presented a PowerPoint presentation showing an aerial view of the site and the nearest residential properties. The Committee was also shown an illustration of the proposed kiosks, the site layout plan, access arrangements and landscaping together with photographs of the site and access road. A plan was shown displaying the access works including temporary works that would be in place during the construction period which would be removed once completed leaving a new improved access to the site.

The officer drew attention to the Update Sheet which contained an additional representation from two local residents, a further comment from LCC Highways and details of an amendment to Condition 2b to include two amended drawings.

Mr Almond, a local resident addressed the committee. He informed the committee that he and other residents in the community, were not against improvements to the treatment works but were opposed to a contradictory proposal to build a permanent new road in order to allow construction vehicles temporary access to the treatment works.

Mr Almond challenged why given the small increase in vehicle movements to the site each week, United Utilities wished to build a new and permanent road, destroying established wildlife habitat and numerous trees including some that are subject to Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs). Mr Almond suggested that the two landowners who individually own the significant parcels of land to the east and west of the proposed new permanent road had an interest in the creation of a new and permanent road onto their land that might support potential future development opportunities. He therefore called on the committee to refuse the application as a new and permanent road was not required.

County Councillor Alan Schofield addressed the committee on behalf of a number of local residents. He urged the committee to refuse the application for the following summarised reasons:

- The application involves the unnecessary wanton, complete destruction (and would be non-restorable) of land with numerous mature trees etc among significant environmental habitat land known locally as 'The Croft'.
- There is an available, alternative non-destructive route for the temporary construction traffic i.e. via a short & wide public highway off Ribchester Rd
- The proposed development would impinge on the footpath and on the safety of the numerous walkers who use the Clayton-le-Dale FP46.

Following debate and in response to concerns raised by the Committee, the officer confirmed that any future TPOs with regard to the replacement trees would be a matter for the borough council to determine; that the development would be of a temporary nature; and that the land and temporary parts of the access route would be restored following the completion of construction.

**Resolved:** That subject to the amendment to condition 2b as outlined in the Update Sheet, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report to the committee.

**6. Wyre Borough: application number. LCC/2020/0069  
Hybrid planning application including full application for 3 storey, 45 bed space care home facility, widening and rerouting of access road, new car parking areas, summerhouse, energy centre, cycle and bin store and landscaping and outline planning application for development of 3 storey extra care facility consisting of 65 apartments following demolition of existing care home facility.  
Bowgreave Rise, Garstang Road, Bowgreave, Garstang.**

A report was presented on an application for a hybrid planning application including a full application for a 3 storey, 45 bed space care home facility, the widening and rerouting of the access road, new car parking areas, summerhouse, energy centre, cycle and bin store and landscaping and outline planning application for development of 3 storey extra care facility consisting of 65 apartments following demolition of existing care home facility at Bowgreave Rise, Garstang Road, Bowgreave, Garstang.

The report included the views of Wyre Borough Council, Barnacre-with-Bonds Parish Council, LCC Ecology Service, LCC Highways Development Control, United Utilities, the Lead Local Flood Authority and details of two letters of representation received.

The Development Management Officer presented a PowerPoint presentation showing an aerial view of the site and the nearest residential properties. The Committee was also shown illustrations of the proposed developments, site layout plan, access arrangements and landscaping together with photographs of the site and access road.

Following lengthy debate during which time several Members raised concerns about the external appearance of the proposed developments, it was Moved and Seconded that:

'Planning permission be granted subject to an amendment to condition 3a to require that the external elevations of the building shall include the use of natural stone or stone cladding materials for the lower ground floor elevation'.

**Resolved:-** That subject to the amendment to condition 3a above, planning permission be **Granted** subject to the conditions set out in the report to the Committee.

**7. Preston City and South Ribble Boroughs: application number LCC/2021/0002**  
**Works associated with areas 1 and 2 of the Preston and South Ribble flood risk management scheme consisting of new and replacement flood defences along the north and south banks of the River Ribble and other ancillary flood works, including: land re-profiling, landscaping and habitat creation, works to tie-in to the grade II listed Penwortham Old Bridge and railway viaduct over River Ribble, a temporary remote construction compound and temporary site access at Broadgate, Riverside and Riverside Road, Preston**

A report was presented on an application for works associated with areas 1 and 2 of the Preston and South Ribble flood risk management scheme consisting of new and replacement flood defences along the north and south banks of the River Ribble and other ancillary flood works, including: land re-profiling, landscaping and habitat creation, works to tie-in to the grade II listed Penwortham Old Bridge and railway viaduct over River Ribble, a temporary remote construction compound and temporary site access at Broadgate, Riverside and Riverside Road, Preston.

It was noted that the application is part of a wide-ranging Preston and South Ribble Flood Risk Management Scheme consisting of new and improved flood defences to better manage flood risk along the River Ribble and River Darwen to provide greater flood protection to approximately 4,800 properties across Preston and South Ribble.

The report included the views of South Ribble Borough Council, Preston City Council, Penwortham Town Council, LCC Ecology Service, the Environment Agency, Natural England, Network Rail, Lancashire County Archaeology Service, Lancashire Landscape Service, Historic England, The Marine Management Organisation, Lancashire Gardens Trust, United Utilities, the Lead Local Flood Authority, Ribble Steam Railway, Sport England, National Grid Gas and Electricity and details of 14 letters of representation received.

The Development Management Officer presented a PowerPoint presentation showing an aerial view of the site along the north and south banks of the River Ribble and an overview location plan. The Committee was also shown photographs of the various locations along the river bank and a visualisation of the concrete flood wall along Broadgate and the flood defence arrangement adjacent to Penwortham Methodist Church.

The legal officer read out a written statement on behalf of Mr Julian Edwards, Chair of the Penwortham Allotments and Gardens Association. Mr Edwards pointed out that although the Allotments were understandably low priority, they

were a valued community asset which merited protection where possible. Unlike others affected by the proposal it was felt that the allotments derived no benefit or protection from the proposed scheme. Fundamental to the Association's concerns was the issue of land drainage and the possibility that the scheme might exacerbate other drainage issues and flood risk to the Allotments. Although the Association accepted the risk of flooding to protect other properties, it was felt that the proposed scheme did not optimised the steps to ensure the site returns quickly after a flood event. This included ensuring that Fish House Brook is dredged and cleared to facilitate the rapid return of the usability of the site in the event of a flood. He called for realistic, not theoretic, consideration of the Association's concerns and appropriate mitigating steps.

Mr Jonathan Croft, FRM Senior Adviser, Environment Agency addressed the committee and spoke in support of the application. He advised that the Agency had taken on board the concerns raised by the Penwortham Allotments and Gardens Association with regard to Fish House Brook and would be looking to improve conveyance through their maintenance programme. In addition, the Agency had met separately with the Chair, Mr Edwards and the contractor to discuss the design and construction details and how the scheme would impact on the boundary between the church and the allotment site. Mr Croft went on to explain that the river system had been assessed locally using a state of the art model which had concluded that any increase in flood risk to the Penwortham Holme area would be down to climate change alone rather than the proposed flood risk management scheme. Mr Croft concluded by detailing the extensive consultation process that had taken place with over 3 thousand properties affected by the scheme. This included the Penwortham Allotments and Gardens Association.

The officer responded to questions raised by the Members in respect of the design and materials of the replacement flood wall. It was also queried whether any preventative measures could be taken to stop people walking along the top of such along Broadgate between Liverpool Road Bridge and Penwortham Old Bridge. It was noted that that the application did not extend to Avenham Park and its café, however, the committee was advised that the pavilion café was the subject of a bespoke improvement plan and that this was a separate matter.

Following further debate it was:

**Resolved:** That planning permission and Listed Building Consent be **granted** subject to conditions set out in the report to the committee.

#### **8. Decisions taken on development control matters by the Head of Planning and Environment in accordance with the County Council's Scheme of Delegation**

It was reported that since the last ordinary meeting of the Committee on 3 March 2021, three planning applications had been granted planning permission by the Head of Service Planning and Environment in accordance with the county council's Scheme of Delegation.

**Resolved:** That the report be noted.

**9. Urgent Business**

There were no items of urgent business.

**10. Date of Next Meeting**

**Resolved:** That the next meeting of the Committee be held on Wednesday 16 June, 2021 at 10.30am.

L Sales  
Head of Corporate Services

County Hall  
Preston