

## Planning Committee

Thursday, 3rd March, 2022, 6.00 pm

Shield Room, Civic Centre, West Paddock, Leyland PR25 1DH

### Supplementary Agenda

I am now able to enclose, for consideration at the above meeting of the Planning Committee, the following information:

- |          |  |                   |
|----------|--|-------------------|
| <b>6</b> | <b>07/2020/00768 - The Windmill, Samlesbury</b>            | (Pages 137 - 138) |
|          | Addendum attached.   |                   |
| <b>9</b> | <b>07/2021/01247/REM - Shaw Brook Road and Altcar Lane</b> | (Pages 139 - 140) |
|          | Addendum attached.   |                   |

Gary Hall  
Chief Executive

Electronic agendas sent to Members of the Planning Committee

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 6

## Planning Committee Update Sheet 03.03.2021

### Item 6 07/2020/00768/FUL Windmill Hotel

Since the agenda has been published a further 8 letters of objection have been received together with a 40- page booklet entitled “Windmill Business Opposition Booklet”. The booklet has been circulated to members of the planning committee.

A further email has been received by Sheila Wright Planning raising the following points.

- 1 In the revised AQA Table A1.1 highway links L6 and L7 do not seem to have any additional traffic generated from the proposed development. Not all the development traffic will pass to/from the A677 junction. The comments from the EHO confirm that their positive response is only based on the increase in 95 AADT traffic flow data, not the actual six-fold increase in vehicle movements to/from the site that we have presented and the potential for adverse amenity impacts this will lead to. There has been no response from the EHO on this and the point has simply not been addressed.
- 2 The RSA – this has now been undertaken, which is welcomed, but the audit only appears to have been applied to the plan provide in the RSA in **appendix b**. This is confirmed in appendix a of the RSA – it is only the tracking plan for the **inbound** access that has been audited, not the scheme in its entirety.
- 3 Following on from point 2 above it is noted that the plan in **appendix b** does not show the exit points from the site onto Branch Road, but just shows the tracked vehicle entry to the inbound access from Preston Road. We strongly request that the LPA ask the applicant to confirm why they have not requested the full site and all access arrangements to be assessed, as these points have been made to them on all access movements numerous times.
- 4 The request for the applicant to provide clear swept path drawings showing how any delivery vehicle (rigid, pantechnicon or articulated vehicle) can exit onto Branch Road **still** has not been presented – this was raised many months ago to the LPA/LHA, with the point made that all parties need certainty that if residents park outside their properties can vehicles safely exit the site without conflict or the need to reverse/shunt to make the manoeuvre to the Preston New Road/Branch Road junction – this information has not been provided and it is noted that this has not been commented on in the RSA.
- 5 Any comments or amendments to the scheme design following the RSA should be responded to in a Response Report, in line with GG119. This does appear to have been prepared and submitted to the LPA/LHA for information and would normally be expected to provide commentary as to how the matter raised by the RSA team has been overcome.
- 6 We note that the LHA are maintaining their position that no further assessment work to assess the impacts of a six-fold increase in traffic movements onto/off the site is required. This is despite the fact that the Inspector at the appeal identified that that there would be serious adverse impacts on residential amenity arising from a significant increase in traffic movements.

# Agenda Item 6

**A verbal update will be provided to these points at the meeting.**

# Agenda Item 9

**Planning Committee Update Sheet 03.03.2021**

**Item 9 07/2021/01247/REM Altcar Lane Redrow Homes**

**Paragraph 9.6.2 and 9.7.1**

The measurement referenced by a ZZ in paragraph 9.6.2 and 9.7.1 reads 80 metres.

Apologies.

This page is intentionally left blank