**APPENDIX F**

**Summary of Consultees Workshop Event Friday 3rd May 2019**

Key place making, infrastructure and delivery issues must be resolved through the Masterplanning process to provide clarity and certainty for the adoption of the Masterplan and future planning application submissions. Set out below are the Council and Consultees comments on and requirements for the site to be included in the Masterplan and to inform future planning applications.

**What is unique selling point of the site?**

The Masterplan Vision highlights a strong environmental driver for the Lanes. Key words and phrases extracted from the Vision statement reinforce this and include: ‘Greenspace’, ‘biodiversity corridors’, ‘variety of open space’, ‘walking & cycling’, ‘village green’, ‘3G playing pitch’, ‘semi-natural green space’, ‘SUDs’, ‘sustainable links to the wider landscape’, ‘allotments’, ‘connective green space’, ‘public rights of way’, ‘ecological features’, ‘natural play’, ‘nature watching’, ‘community woodland’, ‘swales’, ‘wetlands’, ‘ponds’, ‘sustainable movement networks’, ‘biodiversity maintained and enhanced’.

**The Council consider this environmental driver should be given priority when addressing the key spatial issues of drainage, open space, highway infrastructure; all modes of transport, and service provision and should be the focus for establishing the overall framework for development at the Lanes.**

**Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDs), surface water and foul drainage**

A Surface Water Drainage Strategy and Water Run-off Strategy should be designed for the **whole** site with existing ditches and existing flow routes/watercourses to be retained wherever possible. There is an existing land drain to north and Mill brook. Easements to existing watercourses a consideration.

Legislation is coming is to enable United Utilities to adopt SUDS. Therefore where SUDs form part of the open space, these will need to be designed to adoptable standards.

Development must avoid areas most prone to flooding.

Surface water not to discharge into UU sewer

Highlight that care to be taken where SUDs expected to be wet at times and the design should be with the safety of children in mind, particularly near school and play areas.

There needs to be separation of the SUDs from the A582 as the highway edge cannot be used as a retaining feature.

The culvert at Penwortham Way is already undersized and will need to be enlarged as part of an early phase.

Workshop attendees discussed their joint understanding of the surface water drainage strategy and captured in a sketch (see appendix 1). This sketch could form the basis of a more detailed workshop between the developer and the LLFA/UU to establish if the understanding of the drainage strategy is correct and whether the proposed SUDs requires further modification. This could also include a discussion on foul drainage routes and the requirements for pumping.

SUDs in proximity to PROW and drainage running onto PROWs needs careful consideration and detailing to ensure ease of maintenance. SUDs can act as a barrier to movement where located close to key amenities but with no crossing points.

In respect of Foul drainage, the site is isolated in terms of a foul drainage network and there is nothing on site at present with existing properties using septic tanks.

Question - What work has been done in respect of Foul drainage? Has any modelling been done? What discussions have been undertaken with UU to date?

A Foul Water Drainage Strategy should be discussed with United Utilities as part of the Masterplan process, before planning application stage.

Sewers and waste water runs to ideally be straight as the system will require pumping. The site is flat and pumping station will be required at central point of site. Connection into existing sewer.

**Green Infrastructure/POS**

Green Infrastructure promotes the vision for the site and consider the Masterplan doesn’t address this. A hierarchy of green routes and green spaces should be provided. For example equestrian routes; safer routes to school; the Quiet Lanes; etc

Recognition is given to the fact that the current location of main the POS is influenced by constraints and the location of the pylons. Concern is expressed regarding, among other things, the perception and health impacts.

Green space should be accessible by all. All open space should be overlooked for natural surveillance to reduce crime/fear of crime, although some contradiction where natural open space or areas of ecological enhancement to be established.

Where possible, retain existing hedgerows and field boundaries.

Landscaping includes SUDS which are designed to be filled with water most of the time so therefore is not useable and cannot be counted as part of the POS.

Public Health benefits of Green Space for example, provision for ancillary open space to provide the option to promote healthy living and wellbeing

Different forms of POS that are accessible by all

Question of the usability of the open space buffer to railway

Green linkage should be fit for purpose, ie safe, illuminated

**Trees**

An Arboricultural Strategy will be required which concentrates on good quality tree planting in public open space areas. Green space under the pylons to have significant number of trees, broad leaf natives. A view from National Grid/Cadent is needed.

When in proximity to housing will require species to be upright low maintenance trees with shallow roots.

Any existing trees removed will need to be replaced 2 for 1.

Highways do not support trees in adopted highways. Any trees installed would have to meet DMRB specification and the correct tree species must be used – list of approved species available.

Highways would prefer trees in communal spaces.

**Biodiversity**

Will require a Phase 1 habitat survey with plan.

Will need to justify the indicative biodiversity corridors and confirm whether they are based upon grassland, woodland wetland etc.

Biodiversity network – how does this relate to existing identified networks ie LERN.

Defra biodiversity offsetting metric approach will be required as now mandatory.

Ecological Networks within and beyond site. These should not just be lumped into the site’s POS provision.

Ecological provision that doesn’t also provide for public use needed - Ideally, an area should be set aside for the creation of a small woodland and fenced off for wild life and biodiversity and should be maintained.

Lighting in highways must consider ecology and incorporate environmentally friendly light sources.

**Walking, Cycling, Equestrian, Public Transport**

Cycle routes and pedestrian routes need to demonstrate connectivity to employment, education and community facilities and ideally this is an opportunity to improve cycling connectivity in the borough NS and EW across the site and links to Sustrans and wider regional cycleways eg Preston City Centre. Link up to proposed cycle lane on the east side of the A582 widening.

Where cycle/pedestrian routes planned along the CBLR they should ideally be segregated, if shared use along other access routes then the carriageway will need to be widened by 3m.

Going forward, planning applications will need to demonstrate cycle storage designed to Secured By Design New Homes 2019 p 68.

Footpaths to be designed to Secured By Design New Homes 2019, ie straight and well lit.

Green travel plan with demonstration of change to other modes of transport through SMART bus routes, walkable neighbourhoods etc.

Electric car charging facilities.

Bus routes to be designed to take account of phasing of development – providing a service both during and after completion. Good bus service access for school, community centre and shops as well as any affordable housing. Coach and other large/delivery/emergency vehicle access to school, shops and community facilities required.

Equestrian routes and how these are to be accommodated within the Masterplan needs developing

Question, what exactly is a ‘super-crossing’ as demonstrated on the latest draft Masterplan?

**Public Rights of Way (PROW)**

How have existing PROWs informed the wider network of footpath/cycle route and the development as a whole?

How will links to wider area work? The Masterplan needs to be clearer.

The PROWs need to be identified on the Masterplan and protected, with particular reference to treatment alongside SUDs or other flooding risks.

Services not to be provided within the PROWs.

Care taken to provide quality surface for PROWs and ideally not tarmac or be integrated into the estate roads.

Avoid narrow routes alongside buildings or between walls/fences.

Planting schemes to follow guidance and be no closer than 3m away.

(no details of which guidance was referred to)

Any diversions or closures will need early consultation.

**Cross Borough Link Road**

**For the purposes of the Masterplan the CBLR route is to be identified in full including the proposed new bridge over the railway crossing.**

LCC Highways estimate £5-6M for the bridge which will need to be delivered by the Masterplan overall

A too direct route for the CBLR would not work as it would be too attractive to through traffic and therefore used more. However, LCC Highways are broadly supporting of the route as currently shown on the Masterplan. Traffic calming measures needed to manage traffic. . Measures can include 30mph speed limit, self-enforcing traffic calming such as side roads, combined private driveways, bends in road. Guidance is contained in Manual for Streets; Creating Civilised Streets

Pedestrian provision required on both sides of carriage way and incorporate cycle route

**Green Lanes**

Quiet Lanes - How will these existing lanes work during the short term Bee Lane access scenario? Concerns is how will ‘through’ users be prevented from using these lanes and how will conflict between pedestrians/cyclists/horse riders/vehicles be managed until the infrastructure/CBLR is in place.

The existing lanes within the site are rural in nature and narrow and are adopted. Therefore the Quiet Lanes will be required to follow statutory guidance. See http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2006/2082/pdfs/uksiem\_20062082\_en.pdf

There is a danger they will become ‘rat runs’ and measures must be included to discourage this. This will need further discussion with LCC Highways.

Existing properties/businesses on site and some have huge vehicles. How will the ‘Quiet Lanes’ idea serve these properties, eg used by equestrian horse boxes etc

How will the interaction between roads for the wider site and the lanes work?

**Access/Traffic**

What is the Access Strategy? We understand this is currently being reviewed and the consultants are looking at the analysis again. Continue to liaise with LCC Highways about the 90/10 split as this is not considered acceptable.

The access(s) must give strong identity into site and be attractive and visual – gateways which provide a sense of arrival. What is the treatment of important gateways, particularly the main access to site which is currently very green. Does this reflect an appropriate design cue?

The demolition of the existing community centre will help achieve an access road to Kingsfold.

Access to north is important for all modes but not HGV. However, this route is paramount for public transport/bus routing and larger vehicles such as coaches would need access to the community centre.

Strong linkages to urban area to north are required to prevent an us/them scenario but needs to be managed. Concern expressed regarding permeability and how the development provides access to existing neighbouring development. Narrow secluded access routes are not encouraged.

Key access points for public transport with good surveillance. Permeability achieved where access is alongside other movement routes to help design out crime and anti-social behaviour.

Public Transport access to key community facilities and affordable housing. A 400m distance to bus stop is considered reasonable. Should include safe walk ways to access bus stops

Potential for 2 bus routes

Park and Ride – question its need and deliverability. What is its purpose? How is this promoted? Is this realistic or just an aspiration?

Requires travel into the site to access it which will impact on traffic on roads to it.

Parking provision location for park and ride?

**Parking**

A parking strategy is required.

Parking courts to apartments to have natural surveillance, well lit, situated at the front of the building. Ideally, rear parking courts should be avoided, although Active rooms to overlook parking courts can work.

Generally parking needs to be at the front of dwellings but minimise on-street parking as this can cause problems to bus routes

**Affordable Housing Requirements**

The site presents a great opportunity to deliver affordable housing at a mixed tenure range to meet the needs of the borough in a sustainable location. The site is well located in relation to existing local services and as was demonstrated at the workshop today, the provision of infrastructure and services will likely increase as the site is developed.

In terms of need, the borough has a particular need for smaller affordable units (which is evidenced in the SHMA), for example one and two bedroom flats and two and three bedroom houses. In terms of market housing need, there is a suggested need for two, three and four bedroom houses.

We need to be mindful that the development is going to be phased over a period of up to 15 years so it is important to understand that housing need may change over this time and demand for the types of affordable housing tenures may change as different phases come forward for planning permissions. It would be appropriate to feedback on this at the time of a detailed application.

Our population is growing and ageing and there is a need to provide accommodation for our ageing population. Whilst this can be offered by a range of accommodation, there is a clear need for bungalows across all tenures. It seems that the masterplan is indicating that provision to meet the needs of our ageing population will be purely from the offer of apartment accommodation which is not particularly appropriate.

Bringing it back to affordable housing, we would expect that any affordable housing proposals are developed in partnership with a registered provider as this will ensure that any development is in line with the RP’s requirements in terms of design, housing type and space standards and can help to avoid difficulties around acquisition later down the line.

**General Housing Locations and Requirements**

Consider the existing vernacular? Existing dwellings on site generally large detached homes in traditional style. Are perimeter blocks the intended solution?

Consideration to be given to the location of the apartment blocks – will these be the affordable housing?

Variety of housetypes

Promote a green garden type community with ability to live low carbon lifestyles – provision for home working Fibre Broadband; Sky/Openreach; Smart technology

All homes to meet Secured By Design as per Building Regs Approved Doc Q.

Query consideration of lifetime homes standards which is an optional building regs requirement.

Supported living enablement such as installing sensor provision from construction as cheaper than retro fit.

Consider Modern Methods of Construction or offsite manufacture solutions to accelerate construction times and respond to skills shortage.

To include recycling collections and storage provision.

Low carbon energy solutions for all dwellings.

**Commercial/Retail**

Location of retail. Discussion was that the retail needs to be next to the Village Green/green space. What type of Village Green? Could the village green include convenience store/Farm shop/Pharmacy? Preference for no takeaways or other uses which promote anti-social behaviour.

Some employment provision to be located within the Village centre and be a low scale office accommodation type.

Consider servicing and security of delivery vehicles etc to commercial premises.

**Health**

No references to Health provision in the Masterplan document.

A Health Impact Assessment will be required.

All existing facilities are at capacity.

Lostock Hall Health Centre proposal for larger building but location is not accessible/sustainable to the whole of the Masterplan site.

Health Centre or similar provision should be within the site.

Essential to carry out early engagement with NHS CCG and Public Health & Wellbeing @ Lancashire County Council

**Education**

The primary school is to be funded by CIL as part of the CIL 123 list. Suitable land will need to be identified in the Masterplan.

Query primary school location in current revised position. Shape of plot of concern. Location next to SUDs of concern.

Education team will need to revise their feasibility study for a 2FE school.

Phased delivery of school to be confirmed. Details of the timings. There is some capacity in existing schools.

Roads near to school will have to be designed to allow safe drop off/parking. Encourage shift to walking by promoting safer routes to school.

Nursery school places to be confirmed.

Secondary school formula will apply.

**Infrastructure delivery planning**

The masterplan will also need to include a section on delivery which should include an ‘ Infrastructure Delivery Plan’ This is necessary to ensure that the masterplan as a whole can deliver all the necessary policy asks and that infrastructure necessary to ensure a sustainable community is delivered in alignment with the housing occupation. This is in accordance with the NPPF 2018 (updated in 2019) and the PPG on viability updated May 2019.

Extract from South Ribble Local Plan adopted July 2015.

*Where sites require a masterplan as part of a condition in the policy or justification text, including the preparation of an agreed Masterplan to achieve the comprehensive development of a Major Site, the following applies. It is expected that a Masterplan will be prepared by the landowner/developer of the site in advance of the submission of any planning applications. It is the Council’s intention that the draft Masterplan should be the subject of consultation with all stakeholders and interested parties, shall be the subject of early discussion with the Council and thereafter adopted for the purposes of development*

*management in the determination of subsequent planning applications. 6.2 The Council welcomes early discussions with landowners/developers on the scope, content and process of preparation of a Masterplan. A Masterplan should set the vision for the site and the strategy for implementing that vision. It should include, as appropriate, an access and movement framework, green infrastructure and ecology mitigation and enhancement, a hydrology and drainage assessment, land use and development capacity analysis, infrastructure requirements, a viability assessment and a phasing and delivery strategy, amongst other matters.*