

Proposed development: Full Planning Application for Erection of 14 dwellings

**Site address:
Land off Albert Street
Hoddlesden**

Applicant: M J Hart Homes

Ward: West Pennine

**Councillors for West Pennine
Councillor Julie Slater
Councillor Colin Rigby OBE
Councillor Jean Rigby**



1.0 SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

1.1 APPROVE – Subject to recommended conditions (see paragraph 4.0).

2.0 KEY ISSUES/SUMMARY OF PLANNING BALANCE

2.1 The Council's Development Plan supports new development within the defined village boundary of Hoddlesden. The proposal will deliver a high quality housing scheme which will widen the choice of family housing in the Borough. It supports the Borough's planning strategy for housing growth as set out in the Core Strategy. The proposal is also satisfactory from a technical point of view, with all issues having been addressed through the application, or capable of being controlled or mitigated through planning conditions.

3.0 RATIONALE

3.1 Site and Surroundings

3.1.1 The application site is an area of previously developed land, last in use as allotments but now cleared, in close proximity to village centre of Hoddlesden. The village centre lies within a designated Conservation Area but does not encompass the application site. The site measures approximately 1.40 hectares, it is irregular in shape, falling from south west to north east. The land is identified as an area of Green Infrastructure within the adopted Local Plan Part 2.

3.1.2 The application site is bounded to the north, south, and west by residential properties, which are predominately of terrace design but differing ages and materials. Dwellings closer to the north are constructed of stone and slate with more modern dwellings to the west constructed of brick, render, stone cladding and concrete roof tiles. The southeast corner of the site is bounded by a small park, commonly referred to as the Millennium Green with wider views out across the valley.

3.1.3 The site, given its rural location, is not well served by public transport with the only service currently in operation being the limited Travel assist service. The site is considered accessible to a range local facilities, including schools, retail, leisure, whilst major employment sites including the Royal Blackburn teaching Hospital, Walker Park and Shadsworth Industrial Estate are located within 5km of the site.

3.2 Proposed Development

3.2.1 The proposal is a full planning application for the erection of 14 dwellings with associated new access, landscaping, parking and associated works.

3.2.2 The proposed development provides a net density of approximately 10 units per hectare, when considering the developable area of 1.40 hectares. The 14 units comprise of; 14no detached houses, 1no. 3-bed, 8no. 4-bed and 5no. 5-bed. The properties have a modern appearance, with the units fronting onto a new central road. The dwellings will be constructed with a mix of brick and stone facing materials with slate roofs, subject to samples.

3.2.3 The development will be served by a new vehicular and pedestrian access, which is to be positioned of the junction of Albert and Sydney Street. The development includes landscaping throughout including a balancing pond. Elsewhere the standard garden treatment will be 1.8 close boarded fencing, though gardens fronting the internal roads will be constructed with 1.8m brick walls.

3.3 Development Plan

3.3.1 The Development Plan comprises the Core Strategy and adopted Local Plan Part 2 – Site Allocations and Development Management Policies. In determining the current proposal, the following are considered to be the most relevant policies:

3.3.2 Core Strategy

- CS1 – A Targeted Growth Strategy
- CS5 - Locations for New Housing
- CS6 – Housing Targets
- CS7 – Types of Housing
- CS16 – Form and Design of New Development

3.3.3 Local Plan Part 2

- Policy 6 – Village Boundaries
- Policy 7 – Sustainable and Viable Development
- Policy 8 – Development and People
- Policy 9 – Development and the Environment
- Policy 10 – Accessibility and Transport
- Policy 11 – Design
- Policy 12 – Developer Contributions
- Policy 18 – Housing Mix
- Policy 40 – Integrating Green Infrastructure and Ecological Networks with New Development

3.4 Other Material Planning Considerations

3.4.1 Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document

This document provides targeted advice to ensure high quality new homes. It aims to ensure that new development reflects the individual and collective character of areas of the Borough and promotes high standards of design.

The document also seeks to ensure a good relationship between existing and proposed development in terms of protecting and enhancing amenity.

3.4.2 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – 2018:

3.4.3 The National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) is a material consideration in planning decisions. The Framework sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development, running through both plan-making and decision-taking. Paragraph 11 of the Framework explains that for decision taking, this means approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay. Section 5 of the Framework relates to delivering a wide choice of high quality homes, and Section 8 relates to promoting healthy communities.

3.4.4 The Framework places a requirement on Council's to provide five years' worth of housing against their housing requirements (paragraph 11 (d)). Applications involving the provision of housing, where there is a situation of local planning authorities not being able to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites (with the appropriate buffer, as set out in paragraph 73), the policies which are most important for determining the applications are then out of date. In such instances, planning permission should be granted unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.

3.5 **Assessment**

3.5.1 In assessing this application there are a number of important material considerations that need to be taken into account as follows:

- Principle;
- Highways and access;
- Design and Layout;
- Amenity impact;
- Drainage; and
- Affordable housing.

3.5.2 Principle

The Adopted Policies Map defines Village Boundaries for Belmont, Chapelton, Edgworth, Hoddlesden and Pleasington. Policy 6 of the Local Plan states that the Development in the rural area shall be located within these boundaries unless it is specifically supported by another policy in the Local Plan. The site is located within the Hoddlesden village boundary defined on the proposals map.

3.5.4 Policy 7 on Sustainable and Viable Development echoes the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in the NPPF. Thus, applications that accord with policies in the Local Plan will be approved without delay unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

3.6 Highways and Access

- 3.6.1 Core Strategy Policy 22: Accessibility Strategy and Local Plan Policy 10: Accessibility and Transport, aim to ensure that new developments provide appropriate provision for access, car parking and servicing so as to ensure the safe, efficient and convenient movement of all highway users is not prejudiced.
- 3.6.2 The proposal identifies a vehicular and pedestrian access at the junction of Albert and Sydney Street. In addition, temporary provision will be made for 6 car parking spaces for residents during construction which will be reduced to 4 permanent spaces upon completion of the development.
- 3.6.3 Parking provision for the development is in accordance with the Council's adopted parking standards; 2 spaces for 2/3 bed units and 3 spaces for 4+ bedroom properties. Furthermore the driveway parking spaces are all compliant with the adopted space requirements of 5.5m x 2.4m and 3m x 6m for garage spaces.
- 3.6.4 A Transport Statement (TS) was submitted in support of the application which evaluated the existing transport and highways context of the site, access, parking and servicing conditions, trip generation and junction capacity. This allows an assessment as to whether the highways network has the capacity to accommodate the potential increases in traffic as a result of significant new residential development; and whether there would be any detriment to highway safety. The TS concluded that;
- The scheme accords with local and national policy as the application site is adjacent to good transport linkages and other attractions to minimise trips and share trip movements.
 - The site has a sustainable location and the site layout is designed to accord with good practice.
 - There are no operational issues that would arise if the development was to proceed, as such the scheme would have little or no impact on the local network.
 - It is considered that there are no reasons that could be considered severe in nature to prevent the scheme to be approved from a transportation point of view.
- 3.6.5 Highways Colleagues appraised the submission and whilst no objection was offered in principle concerns were raised in relation to construction vehicles traffic, accessibility of refuse vehicles and generally access and egress to the site. The applicant has sought to address these concerns through, dialogue with council officers, submission of vehicle tracking details, onsite neighbour parking during and post construction alongside off-site highways works.
- 3.6.6 Following the initial submission and subsequent discussions on highways issues raised by Council Officers, the applicant has put forward additional

details to overcome the issues. This includes a robust construction management plan to include:

- Restriction of goods vehicles entering the site to rigid wagons of no more than 12m length.
- Any deliveries involving larger vehicles will be broken down off-site on the applicant's land at the junction of Harwoods Lane and Roman Road and transported to the site in a compliant vehicle.

3.6.7 The applicant has also shown willingness, if the local planning authority, following consultation with residents, considers that temporary traffic management arrangements should be made on Albert Street, Graham Street and/or Sydney Street. The applicant will meet the council's reasonable costs in implementation. Further to this the applicant has agreed to fund the provision of traffic calming measures on Queens Street to control the speed of traffic entering the village from the east. The measures will comprise of a Vehicle Activated Speed Sign (VASS) and textured surfacing to the highway located on the approach to Graham Street from the East.

3.6.8 The Council's Highway Team having reviewed the supplementary information welcomes the changes, but also sets out a series of conditions required in order to support the proposal;

(1) A construction management plan will be required through application of a condition, setting out how the construction process will be managed to ensure that consideration is given to highway safety and residential amenity during the construction phase. The plan will include the following:

- The parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- Loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- Storage of plant and materials;
- Erection and maintenance of security hoardings,
- Wheel washing type and location;
- Control of dust and dirt;
- Recycling and disposing of waste;
- Turning of vehicles within the site
- Overall management of site operations
- Phasing of the development

(2) Prior to the occupation of any of the dwellings hereby approved, details of the proposed arrangements for future management and maintenance of the proposed streets within the development shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The streets shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved management and maintenance details until such time as an agreement has been entered into under section 38 of the Highways Act 1980 or a private management and Maintenance Company has been established.

(3) Prior to the construction of any of the streets referred to in the previous condition full engineering, drainage, street lighting and constructional details

of the streets shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall, thereafter, be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

(4) Sightlines at vehicular access points to be safeguarded in perpetuity

(5) During and post construction parking plan for adjoining residents

(6) Traffic management scheme

(7) Prior to commencement a condition survey of the highway would need to be undertaken to ensure a record is taken of the condition of the highway. All damage sustained as a consequence of the development (construction work) to the highway would need to be remediated by the developer, at their costs.

(8) Grampian condition, for works to be carried out as part of a 278 scheme. This would include;

- VASS (Vehicle Activated Speed Sign)
- Textured Surfacing to the entrance at Graham Street
- Improved sightlines at junction of Sydney Street/Queen Street

3.6.9 Overall, the scope of information submitted in support of the transport and highways aspects of the proposal illustrate an acceptable highways layout and off-site highways works that will mitigate the likely impacts on the network. As such, subject to compliance with the aforementioned conditions, it is in accordance with the requirements of Policy 10 of the Local Plan Part 2.

3.7 Design and Layout

3.7.1 Policy 11 of the Local Plan requires development to present a good standard of design, demonstrating an understanding of the wider context and make a positive contribution to the local area. The policy sets out a list of detailed design requirements relating to character, townscape, public realm, movement, sustainability, diversity, materials, colour and viability. This underpins the main principles of sustainable development contained in the NPPF.

3.7.2 The proposed development provides a net density of approximately 9 units per hectare, when considering the developable area of 1.49 hectares. The 14 units comprise of; 14no detached houses, 1no. 3-bed, 8no. 4-bed and 5no. 5-bed. The properties have a modern appearance, with the units fronting onto a new central road. The dwellings will be constructed with a mix of brick and stone facing materials with slate roofs, subject to samples.

3.7.3 Policy 18 of the Local Plan Part 2 illustrates that the Council requires a detached and semi-detached housing offer to be the principal element of the dwelling mix on any site that is capable of accommodating such housing. Given the intended mix the proposal is wholly compliant with this requirement.

- 3.7.4 The properties have carefully considered internal layouts to offer a variety of configurations to appeal to families of varying sizes and needs. The house types represent an appropriate variety of styles and, together with their orientation, will create varied and attractive street scenes. Basic details of the external materials have been submitted but it is still considered to be necessary to impose the Council's condition to require prior approval of submitted materials.
- 3.7.5 Details of the proposed boundary treatments have been provided, alongside a detailed layout to illustrate the boundary treatments for each part of the site. Front gardens are commonly open plan. The standard rear garden treatment will be a 1.8m close boarded fence, but for those sections that flank the estate road the boundaries will be formed by 1.8m walls.
- 3.7.6 The comprehensive details submitted illustrate a design and layout which show dwellings, infrastructure and landscaping which accords with the provisions of the relevant policies of the development plan.

3.8 Amenity Impact

- 3.8.1 Policy 8 of the LPP2 relates to the impact of development upon people. Importantly, at section (ii) of the policy there is a requirement for all new development to secure satisfactory levels of amenity for surrounding uses and future occupiers of the development itself. Reference is made to matters including; noise, vibration, odour, light, dust, privacy/overlooking and the relationship between buildings.
- 3.8.2 The Residential Design Guide SPD indicates an appropriate separation of 21 metres between facing windows of habitable rooms of two storey dwellings, unless an alternative approach is justified to the Council's satisfaction. Where windows of habitable rooms face a blank wall or a wall with only non-habitable rooms a separation of no less than 13.5 metres shall be maintained, again unless an alternative approach is justified to the Council's satisfaction. The development is consistent with these requirements, both in relation to the relationship to properties within the site and those on the periphery.
- 3.8.3 The Council's Public Protection Team has reviewed the application and offers no objection to the development subject to conditions to safeguard the amenity of future occupants of the site and those existing residents in the area. These conditions relate to land contamination; control on working hours (08:00 to 18:00 Mondays to Fridays, 09:00 to 13:00 Saturdays, Not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays); and the provision of electric charging points and gas boiler emissions to safeguard air quality.
- 3.8.4 The overall impact of the proposed development is considered to accord with the provisions of the adopted and Local Plan Part 2 as any potential harm to amenity has been addressed or can be adequately controlled or mitigated through planning conditions.

3.9 Drainage and Flood Risk

3.9.1 Policy 9 sets out that development will be required to demonstrate that it will not be at an unacceptable risk of flooding and impact on environmental assets or interests, including habitats, species and trees.

3.9.2 The application has seen fundamental changes to the proposed drainage layout, which initially proposed to connect drainage to the adjacent Millennium Green, The revised scheme now incorporates a larger balancing pond and a connection to existing drainage. The report concludes;

Foul Water Drainage

- United Utilities has confirmed that foul drainage should be connected to the existing 300mm diameter, combined sewer, which is located to the north west of the site, adjacent to 9 Sydney Street.
- Connections will be subject to approval with United Utilities.

Surface Water Drainage

- Based on the information combined in the Worms Eye site investigation, it is evident that the underlying strata is unsuitable to sustain soakaways as a method for the disposal of surface water run-off.
- Where surface water runoff is to be directed to a river or watercourse, discharge rates from the site should be limited to 5l/s or Qbar, whichever is the greater. For this site, surface water run-off rates to the combined sewer should be limited to 15.7 l/s. Discharge rates to be agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority / Flood Risk Management Team.
- The principles set out in this report should form the basis for the detailed design for the management of surface water run-off from the scheme.
- This will ensure that the development proposals do not represent an increased flood risk to others.
- Subject to the above, the development proposals should be considered satisfactory in respect of flood risk.

3.9.3 Following a review of the revised information, no objection has been offered by United Utilities. The Lead Local Flood Authority is currently assessing the revised information which will be provided by way of an update report. Subject to no objection from the local lead flood authority, and the application of conditions to ensure implementation of the drainage scheme detailed in the strategy, and a scheme for the future maintenance and management of surface water drainage to be agreed, the application is considered to accord with the Council's Development Plan policies for drainage and flood risk.

3.10 Affordable Housing

3.10.1 Core Strategy Policy CS8 advises that all new residential development will be required to contribute towards the Borough's identified need for affordable housing; this being achieved through on-site provision, or through a financial contribution towards off-site delivery. The overall target for affordable housing is set at 20%

3.10.2 Local Plan Policy 12: Developer Contributions, which accords with the NPPF, indicates that where request for financial contributions are made the Council should be mindful of the total contribution liability incurred by developers. The applicant has indicated their desire for on-site provision, and entered into a S106 agreement to provide affordable housing (at 30% discounted market sale) in perpetuity for 1 selected plot (House Type A). The dwelling must remain at a discount for future eligible households.

3.11 Summary

3.11.1 This report assesses the full planning application for 14 dwellings on a parcel of previously developed land, accessed from junction of Albert and Sydney Street, Huddlesden. In considering the proposal a wide range of material considerations have been taken in to account during the assessment of the planning application

3.11.2 The assessment of the proposal clearly shows that the planning decision must be made in terms of assessing the merits of the case against any potential harm that may result from its implementation. This report concludes the proposal provides a high quality housing development with associated infrastructure, which meets the policy requirements of the Blackburn with Darwen Core Strategy, Local Plan Part 2, and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.

4.0 **RECOMMENDATION: Approve subject to**

- (i) That delegated authority is given to the Director of Growth & Development to approve planning permission subject to an agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, relating to the provision of a plot to provide affordable housing (at 30% discounted market sale) in perpetuity. The dwelling must remain at a discount for future eligible households.**

Should the s106 agreement not be completed within 6 months of the date of this resolution, the Director of Growth & Development will have delegated powers to refuse the application

(ii) Conditions relating to the following matters

- Commence within 3 years
- Approved details/drawings
- Materials to be submitted and implemented
- Sightlines clearance to be kept in perpetuity for all access points
- Construction management plan to be submitted and implemented

- Prior to the occupation of any of the dwellings hereby approved, details of the proposed arrangements for future management and maintenance of the proposed streets within the development shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The streets shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved management and maintenance details until such time as an agreement has been entered into under section 38 of the Highways Act 1980 or a private management and Maintenance Company has been established.
- Prior to the construction of any of the streets referred to in the previous condition full engineering, drainage, street lighting and constructional details of the streets shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall, thereafter, be constructed in accordance with the approved details.
- Permitted development rights to be removed (Part 1, Classes A to E)
- Land contamination (standard conditions)
- Limitation of construction site works to: 08:00 to 18:00 Mondays to Fridays, 09:00 to 13:00 Saturdays, Not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.
- A scheme employing best practicable means for the suppression of dust during the period of construction to be agreed/implemented.
- Development to be undertaken in accordance with recommendations set submitted Ecological Survey and Assessment
- Drainage to be undertaken in accordance with the submitted Strategy
- Pre and post residents parking scheme to be agreed and implemented prior to commencement.
- Traffic management scheme
- Pre and post highway condition survey and repair strategy.
- Grampian condition, for works to be carried out as part of a 278 scheme. This would include;
 - VASS (Vehicle Activated Speed Sign)
 - Textured Surfacing to the entrance at Graham Street
 - Improved sightlines at junction of Sydney Street/Queen Street
- Landscaping and planting scheme to be agreed.
- Provision of electric charging points and gas boiler emissions to safeguard air quality.

5.0 PLANNING HISTORY

5.1 10/17/0940: Erection of 24 Dwellings. Withdrawn

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

6.1.1 Drainage Section

Revised comments to be provided by way of an updated report.

6.1.2 Education Section

No objection or request for commuted sum to education provision within the Borough.

6.1.3 Environmental Services

No objection.

6.1.4 Public Protection

No objections subject to the following conditions;

- Site working hours to be limited to between 8am-6pm (Monday-Friday) and 9am-1pm on Saturdays. No works on Sundays or Bank Holidays.
- Land contamination
- Gas fired domestic heating boilers shall not emit more than 40mg NOx/kWh
- Electric vehicle charging point for each dwelling

6.1.5 Highways:

The submitted Transport Statement is noted and accepted. The application would be supported, subject to adequate parking being provided for the residents of the streets adjacent which would then support the construction vehicle route into and out of the site. This is to be offered prior to commencement of works on site, details of this would be required for approval. Prior to commencement a condition survey of the highway would need to be undertaken to ensure a record is taken of the condition of the highway. All damage sustained as a consequence of the development (construction work) to the highway would need to be remediated by the developer, at their costs.

Further safety measures as discussed and presented in the statement are to be attached as a Grampian condition, for works to be carried out as part of a 278 scheme. This would include;

- VASS (Vehicle Activated Speed Sign)
- Textured Surfacing to the entrance at Graham Street
- Improved sightlines at junction of Sydney Street/Queen Street

Suggested conditions relating to; construction methods statement; details of arrangement for future maintenance and management of the proposed streets, until such time that an agreement has been entered into under section 38 of the Highways Act 1980, or a private maintenance company is established; full details of the engineering, drainage, street lighting and construction details of the streets to be submitted and agreed.

Prior to the commencement of any works that affect or adjoin the adopted highway – contact is to be made with the local highway authority officer Simon Littler on Mob: 07766 578007 Please attach standards conditions/Informatives: Highways, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 90, 10, 11, 12, 15, and 17

6.1.7 Heritage and conservation

No objection offered.

6.1.8 Strategic Housing

The Housing Growth Team would support the development of good quality family homes in this location. The principle of residential dwelling and mix would be acceptable as initial proposals indicate a housing offer, which responds to the Council's growth strategy. We would be supportive of the proposal subject to it meeting planning policy requirements and approval from Development Management.

In accordance with the Council's Affordable Homes Policy the developer will be required to provide 20% of the scheme for affordable housing. This can be on site, off site or through a S106 commuted sum payment. We are supportive of new housing developments coming forward and will be willing to consider negotiating affordable homes provision/commuted sum requirement to support scheme viability.

6.1.9 Lancashire Constabulary

No comments received.

6.1.10 United Utilities

Following our review of the submitted Drainage Strategy, we can confirm the proposals are acceptable in principle to United Utilities and therefore should planning permission be granted we request the following condition is attached to any subsequent Decision Notice:

The drainage for the development hereby approved, shall be carried out in accordance with principles set out in the submitted Foul & Surface Water Drainage Design Drawing TC/P5848/16/002, Rev F - Dated 14/11/2018 which was prepared by Thomas Consulting. For the avoidance of doubt and unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, surface water must drain at the restricted rate of 5 l/s as previously agreed with United Utilities. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory form of development and to prevent an undue increase in surface water run-off and to reduce the risk of flooding.

6.1.11 Capita Ecology

The Ecology Report provided by Pennine Ecology dated July 2017 has been reviewed in line with the proposals. The report indicates that the site is of limited ecological value and clearly identifies biodiversity receptors impacted by the development, we consider the development to be sustainable.

However, the residential development of 14 units is located on the edge of the existing village boundary and may contribute to the deterioration of the green belt which is contrary to planning policy CS5 with release of development.

In addition, the site lies within the Natural England SSSI Impact Risk Zone (IRZ) of the West Pennine Moorland SSSI, however consultation with Natural England may not be necessary as their threshold for consultation is any rural residential development of 50 or more houses outside existing settlements/urban areas. In any case the issues that would need to be addressed will be direct land take within the SSSI (the development appears to be 740 m outside the SSSI), disturbance that could affect the upland bird assemblage and any associated impacts that could lead to a deterioration of habitats within the SSSI such as increased recreation and access.

We would also recommend in line with providing enhancements for the scheme:

- Vegetation loss should be minimised around the boundary of the site and retained vegetation should be protected in line with BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction as these will provide an important linkage to the wider environment. Any loss should be compensated for with native species planting.
- Biodiversity on the site should be enhanced through a detailed landscape strategy in order to retain general character and include biodiversity, compensation and management for the development in order to provide biodiversity gains.
- Avoidance of installation of artificial lighting wherever possible in light of the above and restrict its usage where complete avoidance is not possible (using hoods/cowls etc.) and direct light away from any vegetation and tree line. See the Bat Conservation Trust Guidelines - Artificial lighting and wildlife, for details http://www.bats.org.uk/pages/bats_and_lighting.html.

6.1.12 Public consultation

Public consultation has taken place, with 66 letters posted to neighbouring addresses. Site notices have been displayed and a press notice issued. This consultation process was undertaken again following receipt of updated information. In response, 66 letters of objection have been received and the material planning considerations are summarised below. A selection of the written objections are set out within section 9.0 of this report.

- -Highways: Access/traffic/Safety
- -Public transport
- - Visual Impact on conservation area
- - Privacy
- - Ground conditions: Flooding
- - Deficiencies in social facilities: Schools/doctors
- - Loss of privacy
- - Capacity of physical infrastructure, e.g. in the public drainage or water systems

- - Ecological Impact
- - Landscaping

5 Letters of support have also been received; these are contained within section 9 of the report.

- 7 CONTACT OFFICER: Alec Hickey, Senior Planner, Development Management**
- 8 DATE PREPARED: 4th February 2019**

9 SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

Objection Mr McIlveen. Rec – 14/05/2018

Re: Proposed Development in Hoddlesden (planning ref 10/18/0326)

I am writing with regards to the proposed development on the allotments in Hoddlesden. As a Hoddlesden resident who lives close to the proposed development, I am extremely worried for the following reasons:

- 1) Despite the fact that this application is for a reduced number of dwellings compared with the previous unsuccessful application, the fact remains that the additional traffic generated by this proposal would be detrimental to the centre of the village and would be very dangerous. Already cars speed through the village and any increase in the number of vehicles would result in a significantly increased risk of a serious accident. There are regular “near-misses” at the junction of Sydney Street and Queen Street. Moreover, the additional volume of cars would have an **unacceptable impact on the village’s already overcrowded roads.**

through roads for a housing development. Already the junctions of Queen St / Sydney St and Queen St / Graham St regularly experience accidents and near-misses, with cars parked dangerously and visibility poor; the increase in traffic would greatly exacerbate this problem. In addition these roads are already in a very poor state of repair, any additional traffic would cause them to deteriorate even faster.

Furthermore, residents of Hargreaves St are required to reverse out of the lane at the rear of their properties, due to the lack of a turning point. As such, the existing junction of Hargreaves St / Albert St / Sydney St, which has also already experienced accidents, would become **substantially more dangerous and accident-prone.** There are 11 existing dwellings along Hargreaves Street, with approximately 15 vehicles. Some of these are able to park on the lane at the back of Hargreaves Street, but others have to take pot luck on Sydney/Albert/Graham Street. A MAJOR issue for me is the fact that this proposal contains **no acknowledgement whatsoever of the existence of the lane and its current traffic volume.**

- 2) Parking is a huge issue around the village's terraced streets and the development would exacerbate the problem. Whilst the proposal shows that parking would be provided for the new houses, some households would have additional vehicles and guests, all of whom would end up parking on the terraced streets, **taking the already limited spaces from residents.**

Additionally, when the streets become congested, they frequently become impassable, especially for larger vehicles. Our most serious concern is that emergency vehicles such as **fire engines and ambulances would be unable to access the houses** (and this would include the houses in the proposed development).

- 3) There is still no suitable access to the site. Sydney St, Albert St and Graham St are part of a conservation area with narrow cobbled streets. They were never designed to be

It is not at all clear what the arrangement would be for the junction between the lane and Sydney Street. There seems to be a continuation of the pavement right across the lane. This is in my view extremely dangerous, as pedestrians would not always be aware of traffic coming down the lane, as visibility is so poor.

- 4) The proposed balancing pond will be dangerous. The size of the pond and its location make it likely that children would play in it, at serious risk to their lives.

In addition, I am concerned that the balancing pond will not adequately address the **significant drainage issues of the site.** Already the access road to Hargreaves St frequently becomes waterlogged by surface water run off from the allotments site. This in turn causes problems on Sydney St. Development of the site and its being hardscaped would lead to a **massive increase in water run off** and potentially to the flooding of existing houses.

It is also very unclear where the outflow from the balancing pond would go. It would seem to somehow connect to the culvert which runs along the middle of Hoddlesden Millennium Green. This culvert already floods on a regular basis and any additional volume of water would create a very dangerous flooding situation. In addition, as I am sure you are aware, the Green is a Fields in Trust heritage site, and as such, specific approval to achieve the connection would need to be granted.

- 5) Running under Sydney St and Albert St there is a disused railway tunnel that used to serve the mines. Would the existing road structure above the tunnel be strong enough to support heavy construction traffic followed by a significant increase in residential traffic?
- 6) Given the recent discovery of unrecorded mine shafts in the area of the new Darwen Relief Road, surely a mining survey should be undertaken on the site of the proposed development to rule out any similar surprises, which could well render the development unviable.

- 7) There is already a large surplus of applications to St Paul's Primary School in the village. With the increased population from the development, would children in the village be guaranteed a place at the school?
- 8) In order for the proposed site layout to be implemented, I believe this would necessitate taking land owned by other residents. In particular this applies to the proposed footpath out onto Chapman Road, and the proposed improvements to the junction of Sydney Street and Queen Street. Surely this would not be permitted?
- 9) Once again, the drainage strategy report which accompanies this application is completely invalid as it references a plan which includes access from Chapman Road. This is exactly the same document as was submitted with the previous application, and clearly needs to be updated to reflect the actual plan layout before the application can proceed.
- 10) The application includes an updated transport statement. I would make the following points :
 - a. The accident review section on page 14 refers to one recorded accident in 2013, and concludes that this level of accidents would not be considered an issue. I know for a fact that there have been several accidents around the junctions of Sydney Street and Graham Street, including one just a few days ago. The fact that these were not recorded, presumably because the emergency services were not called, does not mean that these should not be taken into consideration.
 - b. The report includes a parking survey which was carried out over a single 3 hour period on a single day. This can hardly be considered representative of the actual situation, and in my view is a totally inadequate snapshot on which to base any planning decision. The report references an appendix A which is supposed to provide the full survey data, but this is missing from the document. Therefore as it stands this report is incomplete and should be re-issued before the application is allowed to proceed.
 - c. In addition, it is not all clear what the analysis of the survey is trying to state. I am assuming that the column labelled "% Cap." is the % capability of the road in question? If that is the case, then there are anomalies in the analysis, as in the summary the Ranken Arms car park appears to have 133% capability, which is clearly impossible.

- d. Once again, the transport statement includes details of the Number 33 bus service which are incorrect. In addition it is understood that this bus service is due to be **withdrawn** in June 2018 because of a lack of funding. This will mean that the application site will have **zero public transport access**.
- e. In summary, the transport statement fails to address the concerns raised in the pre-application responses back in 2015. The statement that Back Hargreaves

Street is not affected is completely untrue, and the claim that the impact on Sydney/Albert/Graham Street is sufficiently mitigated to allow accordance with MFS guidance is just not sustainable.

To summarise, the issues with this application which are outlined above, mean that it should not go ahead. The fundamental issue with this application is a lack of suitable vehicular access, as required by the original pre-app responses, which is far from sufficiently mitigated simply because the number of dwellings has been reduced. **There are already significant problems with parking and traffic at the present time**, and if this development were to be approved, this would result in a very much more dangerous situation, one which would inevitably result in even more accidents and potential injury or worse still, loss of life. **I therefore urge you to do the right thing and reject this application.**

Objection H Metcalfe, 65 Glenshiels Avenue. Rec – 18/05/2018

Re: Application Reference 10/18/0326 Land off Albert Street Hoddlesden

Dear Sir,

I wish to object to the building proposal from M J Hart Homes for the development of 14 new residences on the land off Albert St, for the following reasons:

1. 14 new homes, with the addition of a possible 28 cars from the new proposed residences, would result in total chaos along the access routes of Sydney Street and Queen Street. These streets are already congested and at risk of accidents from vehicle's lack of clear vision onto the main Hoddlesden Road.
 2. Residents of Sydney Street and Queen Street use these cobbled streets to park. The streets become over congested at peak times, with hardly any room for the width of a single vehicle to manoeuvre around, for larger vehicles it is impossible. What happens if emergency services require access to the new development?
 3. Hardgreaves Street is a single track road and not fit for additional car use, there is no room for vehicles to turn and cars are often forced to reverse up this road risking accidents.

 4. The Balancing pond sited at the top of the development could prove attractive to young children 'playing out', as the size is similar to a small swimming pool. This could put children at grave danger.
 5. The development will put further pressure for flooding of the much valued Millennium Green, which experienced two bad flooding's last winter.
 6. The drainage strategy report is invalid as it references a plan which includes access by Chapman Road, the present application does not have access from Chapman Road.
 7. The accident review section on page 14 refers to a report carried out in 2013, this is invalid and requires to be updated to 2018.
 8. The map submitted by M J Hart has streets named incorrectly, this level of inaccuracy is concerning.
-

Objection Lisa O'Horo, 6 Carus Avenue, Darwen. Rec – 25/05/2018

Re: Proposed Development in Hoddlesden (planning ref 10/18/0326)

I am writing with regards to the proposed development on the allotments in Hoddlesden. As a Hoddlesden resident who lives close to the proposed development, I am extremely worried for the following reasons:

- 1) Despite the fact that this application is for a reduced number of dwellings compared with the previous unsuccessful application, the fact remains that the additional traffic generated by this proposal would be detrimental to the centre of the village and would be very dangerous. Already cars speed through the village and any increase in the number of vehicles would result in a significantly increased risk of a serious accident. There are regular "near-misses" at the junction of Sydney Street and Queen Street. Moreover, the additional volume of cars would have an **unacceptable impact on the village's already overcrowded roads.**

- 2) Parking is a huge issue around the village's terraced streets and the development would exacerbate the problem. Whilst the proposal shows that parking would be provided for the new houses, some households would have additional vehicles and guests, all of whom would end up parking on the terraced streets, **taking the already limited spaces from residents.**

Additionally, when the streets become congested, they frequently become impassable, especially for larger vehicles. Our most serious concern is that emergency vehicles such as **fire engines and ambulances would be unable to access the houses** (and this would include the houses in the proposed development).

- 3) There is still no suitable access to the site. Sydney St, Albert St and Graham St are part

of a conservation area with narrow cobbled streets. They were never designed to be through roads for a housing development. Already the junctions of Queen St / Sydney St and Queen St / Graham St regularly experience accidents and near-misses, with cars parked dangerously and visibility poor; the increase in traffic would greatly exacerbate this problem. In addition these roads are already in a very poor state of repair, any additional traffic would cause them to deteriorate even faster.

Furthermore, residents of Hargreaves St are required to reverse out of the lane at the rear of their properties, due to the lack of a turning point. As such, the existing junction of Hargreaves St / Albert St / Sydney St, which has also already experienced accidents, would become **substantially more dangerous and accident-prone.** There are 11 existing dwellings along Hargreaves Street, with approximately 15 vehicles. Some of these are able to park on the lane at the back of Hargreaves Street, but others have to take pot luck on Sydney/Albert/Graham Street. A MAJOR issue for me is the fact that this proposal contains **no acknowledgement whatsoever of the existence of the lane and its current traffic volume.**

It is not at all clear what the arrangement would be for the junction between the lane and Sydney Street. There seems to be a continuation of the pavement right across the lane. This is in my view extremely dangerous, as pedestrians would not always be aware of traffic coming down the lane, as visibility is so poor.

- 4) The proposed balancing pond will be dangerous. The size of the pond and its location make it likely that children would play in it, at serious risk to their lives.

In addition, I am concerned that the balancing pond will not adequately address the significant drainage issues of the site. Already the access road to Hargreaves St frequently becomes waterlogged by surface water run off from the allotments site. This in turn causes problems on Sydney St. Development of the site and its being hardscaped would lead to a massive increase in water run off and potentially to the flooding of existing houses.

It is also very unclear where the outflow from the balancing pond would go. It would seem to somehow connect to the culvert which runs along the middle of Hoddlesden Millennium Green. This culvert already floods on a regular basis and any additional volume of water would create a very dangerous flooding situation. In addition, as I am sure you are aware, the Green is a Fields in Trust heritage site, and as such, specific approval to achieve the connection would need to be granted.

- 5) Running under Sydney St and Albert St there is a disused railway tunnel that used to serve the mines. Would the existing road structure above the tunnel be strong enough to support heavy construction traffic followed by a significant increase in residential traffic?
- 6) Given the recent discovery of unrecorded mine shafts in the area of the new Darwen Relief Road, surely a mining survey should be undertaken on the site of the proposed development to rule out any similar surprises, which could well render the development unviable.

7) There is already a large surplus of applications to St Paul's Primary School in the

village. With the increased population from the development, would children in the village be guaranteed a place at the school?

8) In order for the proposed site layout to be implemented, I believe this would necessitate taking land owned by other residents. In particular this applies to the proposed footpath out onto Chapman Road, and the proposed improvements to the junction of Sydney Street and Queen Street. Surely this would not be permitted?

9) Once again, the drainage strategy report which accompanies this application is completely invalid as it references a plan which includes access from Chapman Road. This is exactly the same document as was submitted with the previous application, and clearly needs to be updated to reflect the actual plan layout before the application can proceed.

10) The application includes an updated transport statement. I would make the following points :

- a. The accident review section on page 14 refers to one recorded accident in 2013, and concludes that this level of accidents would not be considered an issue. I know for a fact that there have been several accidents around the junctions of Sydney Street and Graham Street, including one just a few days ago. The fact that these were not recorded, presumably because the emergency services were not called, does not mean that these should not be taken into consideration.
- b. The report includes a parking survey which was carried out over a single 3 hour period on a single day. This can hardly be considered representative of the actual situation, and in my view is a totally inadequate snapshot on which to base any planning decision. The report references an appendix A which is supposed to provide the full survey data, but this is missing from the document. Therefore as it stands this report is incomplete and should be re-issued before the application is allowed to proceed.

- c. In addition, it is not all clear what the analysis of the survey is trying to state. I am assuming that the column labelled “% Cap.” is the % capability of the road in question? If that is the case, then there are anomalies in the analysis, as in the summary the Ranken Arms car park appears to have 133% capability, which is clearly impossible.
- d. Once again, the transport statement includes details of the Number 33 bus service which are incorrect. In addition it is understood that this bus service is due to be withdrawn in June 2018 because of a lack of funding. This will mean that the application site will have zero public transport access.
- e. In summary, the transport statement fails to address the concerns raised in the pre-application responses back in 2015. The statement that Back Hargreaves Street is not affected is completely untrue, and the claim that the impact on Sydney/Albert/Graham Street is sufficiently mitigated to allow accordance with MFS guidance is just not sustainable.

To summarise, the issues with this application which are outlined above, mean that it should not go ahead. The fundamental issue with this application is a lack of suitable vehicular access, as required by the original pre-app responses, which is far from sufficiently mitigated simply because the number of dwellings has been reduced. **There are already significant problems with parking and traffic at the present time**, and if this development were to be approved, this would result in a very much more dangerous situation, one which would inevitably result in even more accidents and potential injury or worse still, loss of life. **I therefore urge you to do the right thing and reject this application.**

Objection Mr Leslie Marsden, 3 Graham Street, Darwen

Re: Proposed Development in Hoddlesden (planning ref 10/18/0326)

I am writing with regards to the proposed development on the allotments in Hoddlesden. As a Hoddlesden resident who lives close to the proposed development, I am extremely worried for the following reasons:

- 1) Despite the fact that this application is for a reduced number of dwellings compared with the previous unsuccessful application, the fact remains that the additional traffic generated by this proposal would be detrimental to the centre of the village and would be very dangerous. Already cars speed through the village and any increase in the number of vehicles would result in a significantly increased risk of a serious accident. There are regular “near-misses” at the junction of Sydney Street and Queen Street. Moreover, the additional volume of cars would have an **unacceptable impact on the village’s already overcrowded roads.**

- 2) Parking is a huge issue around the village’s terraced streets and the development would exacerbate the problem. Whilst the proposal shows that parking would be provided for the new houses, some households would have additional vehicles and guests, all of whom would end up parking on the terraced streets, **taking the already limited spaces from residents.**

Additionally, when the streets become congested, they frequently become impassable, especially for larger vehicles. Our most serious concern is that emergency vehicles such as **fire engines and ambulances would be unable to access the houses** (and this would include the houses in the proposed development).

- 3) There is still no suitable access to the site. Sydney St, Albert St and Graham St are part of a conservation area with narrow cobbled streets. They were never designed to be through roads for a housing development. Already the junctions of Queen St / Sydney St and Queen St / Graham St regularly experience accidents and near-misses, with cars parked dangerously and visibility poor; the increase in traffic would greatly exacerbate this problem. In addition these roads are already in a very poor state of repair, any additional traffic would cause them to deteriorate even faster.

Furthermore, residents of Hargreaves St are required to reverse out of the lane at the rear of their properties, due to the lack of a turning point. As such, the existing junction of Hargreaves St / Albert St / Sydney St, which has also already experienced accidents, would become **substantially more dangerous and accident-prone.** There are 11 existing dwellings along Hargreaves Street, with approximately 15 vehicles. Some of these are able to park on the lane at the back of Hargreaves Street, but others have to take pot luck on Sydney/Albert/Graham Street. A MAJOR issue for me is the fact that this proposal contains **no acknowledgement whatsoever of the existence of the lane and its current traffic volume.**

It is not at all clear what the arrangement would be for the junction between the lane and Sydney Street. There seems to be a continuation of the pavement right across the lane. This is in my view extremely dangerous, as pedestrians would not always be aware of traffic coming down the lane, as visibility is so poor.

- 4) The proposed balancing pond will be dangerous. The size of the pond and its location make it likely that children would play in it, at serious risk to their lives.

In addition, I am concerned that the balancing pond will not adequately address the **significant drainage issues of the site.** Already the access road to Hargreaves St frequently becomes waterlogged by surface water run off from the allotments site. This in turn causes problems on Sydney St. Development of the site and its being hardscaped would lead to a **massive increase in water run off** and potentially to the flooding of existing houses.

It is also very unclear where the outflow from the balancing pond would go. It would seem to somehow connect to the culvert which runs along the middle of Hoddlesden Millennium Green. This culvert already floods on a regular basis and any additional volume of water would create a very dangerous flooding situation. In addition, as I am sure you are aware, the Green is a Fields in Trust heritage site, and as such, specific approval to achieve the connection would need to be granted.

5) Running under Sydney St and Albert St there is a disused railway tunnel that used to serve the mines. Would the existing road structure above the tunnel be strong enough to support heavy construction traffic followed by a significant increase in residential traffic?

6) Given the recent discovery of unrecorded mine shafts in the area of the new Darwen Relief Road, surely a mining survey should be undertaken on the site of the proposed

development to rule out any similar surprises, which could well render the development unviable.

7) There is already a large surplus of applications to St Paul's Primary School in the village. With the increased population from the development, would children in the village be guaranteed a place at the school?

8) In order for the proposed site layout to be implemented, I believe this would necessitate taking land owned by other residents. In particular this applies to the proposed footpath out onto Chapman Road, and the proposed improvements to the junction of Sydney Street and Queen Street. Surely this would not be permitted?

9) Once again, the drainage strategy report which accompanies this application is completely invalid as it references a plan which includes access from Chapman Road. This is exactly the same document as was submitted with the previous application, and clearly needs to be updated to reflect the actual plan layout before the application can proceed.

- 10) The application includes an updated transport statement. I would make the following points :
- a. The accident review section on page 14 refers to one recorded accident in 2013, and concludes that this level of accidents would not be considered an issue. I know for a fact that there have been several accidents around the junctions of Sydney Street and Graham Street, including one just a few days ago. The fact that these were not recorded, presumably because the emergency services were not called, does not mean that these should not be taken into consideration.
 - b. The report includes a parking survey which was carried out over a single 3 hour period on a single day. This can hardly be considered representative of the actual situation, and in my view is a totally inadequate snapshot on which to base any planning decision. The report references an appendix A which is supposed to provide the full survey data, but this is missing from the document. Therefore as it stands this report is incomplete and should be re-issued before the application is allowed to proceed.
 - c. In addition, it is not all clear what the analysis of the survey is trying to state. I am assuming that the column labelled “% Cap.” is the % capability of the road in question? If that is the case, then there are anomalies in the analysis, as in the summary the Ranken Arms car park appears to have 133% capability, which is clearly impossible.
 - d. Once again, the transport statement includes details of the Number 33 bus service which are incorrect. In addition it is understood that this bus service is due to be **withdrawn** in June 2018 because of a lack of funding. This will mean that the application site will have **zero public transport access**.
 - e. In summary, the transport statement fails to address the concerns raised in the pre-application responses back in 2015. The statement that Back Hargreaves Street is not affected is completely untrue, and the claim that the impact on Sydney/Albert/Graham Street is sufficiently mitigated to allow accordance with MFS guidance is just not sustainable.

To summarise, the issues with this application which are outlined above, mean that it should not go ahead. The fundamental issue with this application is a lack of suitable vehicular access, as required by the original pre-app responses, which is far from sufficiently mitigated simply because the number of dwellings has been reduced. **There are already significant problems with parking and traffic at the present time**, and if this development were to be approved, this would result in a very much more dangerous situation, one which would inevitably result in even more accidents and potential injury or worse still, loss of life. **I therefore urge you to do the right thing and reject this application.**

Objection Mrs D Entwistle, 20 Browning Street, Darwen. Rec – 16/05/2018

Re: Proposed Development in Hoddlesden (planning ref 10/18/0326)

I am writing with regards to the proposed development on the allotments in Hoddlesden. As a Hoddlesden resident who lives close to the proposed development, I am extremely worried for the following reasons:

- 1) Despite the fact that this application is for a reduced number of dwellings compared with the previous unsuccessful application, the fact remains that the additional traffic generated by this proposal would be detrimental to the centre of the village and would be very dangerous. Already cars speed through the village and any increase in the number of vehicles would result in a significantly increased risk of a serious accident. There are regular “near-misses” at the junction of Sydney Street and Queen Street. Moreover, the additional volume of cars would have an **unacceptable impact on the village’s already overcrowded roads.**

- 2) Parking is a huge issue around the village’s terraced streets and the development would exacerbate the problem. Whilst the proposal shows that parking would be provided for the new houses, some households would have additional vehicles and guests, all of whom would end up parking on the terraced streets, **taking the already limited spaces from residents.**

Additionally, when the streets become congested, they frequently become impassable, especially for larger vehicles. Our most serious concern is that emergency vehicles such as **fire engines and ambulances would be unable to access the houses** (and this would include the houses in the proposed development).

- 3) There is still no suitable access to the site. Sydney St, Albert St and Graham St are part of a conservation area with narrow cobbled streets. They were never designed to be through roads for a housing development. Already the junctions of Queen St / Sydney St and Queen St / Graham St regularly experience accidents and near-misses, with cars parked dangerously and visibility poor; the increase in traffic would greatly exacerbate this problem. In addition these roads are already in a very poor state of repair, any additional traffic would cause them to deteriorate even faster.

Furthermore, residents of Hargreaves St are required to reverse out of the lane at the rear of their properties, due to the lack of a turning point. As such, the existing junction of Hargreaves St / Albert St / Sydney St, which has also already experienced accidents, would become **substantially more dangerous and accident-prone.** There are 11 existing dwellings along Hargreaves Street, with approximately 15 vehicles. Some of these are able to park on the lane at the back of Hargreaves Street, but others have to take pot luck on Sydney/Albert/Graham Street. A MAJOR issue for me is the fact that this proposal contains **no acknowledgement whatsoever of the existence of the lane and its current traffic volume.**

It is not at all clear what the arrangement would be for the junction between the lane and Sydney Street. There seems to be a continuation of the pavement right across the lane. This is in my view extremely dangerous, as pedestrians would not always be aware of traffic coming down the lane, as visibility is so poor.

- 4) The proposed balancing pond will be dangerous. The size of the pond and its location make it likely that children would play in it, at serious risk to their lives.

In addition, I am concerned that the balancing pond will not adequately address the **significant drainage issues of the site.** Already the access road to Hargreaves St frequently becomes waterlogged by surface water run off from the allotments site. This in turn causes problems on Sydney St. Development of the site and its being hardscaped would lead to a **massive increase in water run off** and potentially to the flooding of existing houses.

It is also very unclear where the outflow from the balancing pond would go. It would seem to somehow connect to the culvert which runs along the middle of Hoddlesden Millennium Green. This culvert already floods on a regular basis and any additional volume of water would create a very dangerous flooding situation. In addition, as I am sure you are aware, the Green is a Fields in Trust heritage site, and as such, specific approval to achieve the connection would need to be granted.

- 5) Running under Sydney St and Albert St there is a disused railway tunnel that used to serve the mines. Would the existing road structure above the tunnel be strong enough to support heavy construction traffic followed by a significant increase in residential traffic?
- 6) Given the recent discovery of unrecorded mine shafts in the area of the new Darwen Relief Road, surely a mining survey should be undertaken on the site of the proposed

development to rule out any similar surprises, which could well render the development unviable.

- 7) There is already a large surplus of applications to St Paul's Primary School in the village. With the increased population from the development, would children in the village be guaranteed a place at the school?
 - 8) In order for the proposed site layout to be implemented, I believe this would necessitate taking land owned by other residents. In particular this applies to the proposed footpath out onto Chapman Road, and the proposed improvements to the junction of Sydney Street and Queen Street. Surely this would not be permitted?
 - 9) Once again, the drainage strategy report which accompanies this application is completely invalid as it references a plan which includes access from Chapman Road. This is exactly the same document as was submitted with the previous application, and clearly needs to be updated to reflect the actual plan layout before the application can proceed.
- 10) The application includes an updated transport statement. I would make the following points :
- a. The accident review section on page 14 refers to one recorded accident in 2013, and concludes that this level of accidents would not be considered an issue. I know for a fact that there have been several accidents around the junctions of Sydney Street and Graham Street, including one just a few days ago. The fact that these were not recorded, presumably because the emergency services were not called, does not mean that these should not be taken into consideration.
 - b. The report includes a parking survey which was carried out over a single 3 hour period on a single day. This can hardly be considered representative of the actual situation, and in my view is a totally inadequate snapshot on which to base any planning decision. The report references an appendix A which is supposed to provide the full survey data, but this is missing from the document. Therefore as it stands this report is incomplete and should be re-issued before the application is allowed to proceed.
 - c. In addition, it is not all clear what the analysis of the survey is trying to state. I am assuming that the column labelled "% Cap." is the % capability of the road in question? If that is the case, then there are anomalies in the analysis, as in the summary the Ranken Arms car park appears to have 133% capability, which is clearly impossible.
 - d. Once again, the transport statement includes details of the Number 33 bus service which are incorrect. In addition it is understood that this bus service is due to be **withdrawn** in June 2018 because of a lack of funding. This will mean that the application site will have **zero public transport access**.

- e. In summary, the transport statement fails to address the concerns raised in the pre-application responses back in 2015. The statement that Back Hargreaves Street is not affected is completely untrue, and the claim that the impact on Sydney/Albert/Graham Street is sufficiently mitigated to allow accordance with MFS guidance is just not sustainable.

To summarise, the issues with this application which are outlined above, mean that it should not go ahead. The fundamental issue with this application is a lack of suitable vehicular access, as required by the original pre-app responses, which is far from sufficiently mitigated simply because the number of dwellings has been reduced. **There are already significant problems with parking and traffic at the present time**, and if this development were to be approved, this would result in a very much more dangerous situation, one which would inevitably result in even more accidents and potential injury or worse still, loss of life. **I therefore urge you to do the right thing and reject this application.**

Objection Mrs H McIlveen Rec – 14/05/2018

Dear Mr Mr Prescott and Mr Hickey

Re: Proposed Development in Hoddlesden (planning ref 10/18/0326)

I am writing with regards to the proposed development on the allotments in Hoddlesden. I am not against some development of the land and the estate seems to be well designed and in keeping with the area. However, I am astounded yet again that the applicant feels that there is a viable access to the development from Sydney street. As a Hoddlesden resident who lives close to the proposed development, I am extremely worried about the impact this development would have on the village. There are already significant road safety issues in this area and any increase in traffic would exacerbate these problems.

My main concern is for the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and drivers. I regularly walk to and from the local school with two children walking at the side of a pram. In order to cross at the zebra crossing (which is the only safe place to cross such a busy road) I am required to cross Albert street and/or Sydney street. I either then walk to the bottom of Sydney street and turn left to walk on the zig-zag signs on the main road (there is no pavement here) towards the zebra crossing. Or, I walk on the pavement in front of the Ranken Arms and across the Ranken Arms car park, being very careful to avoid reversing cars, to get to the crossing. During my journey to and from school, I am sometimes required to dodge cars reversing out of Hargreaves street into Bowling Green Close and cars coming down Bowling Green Close and across Albert street into Sydney street. Only the other day, a young cyclist was crossing the bottom of Back Hargreaves street and narrowly avoided being hit by a car travelling up Sydney street. I also had to step back on to the main road on Thursday as a car nearly reversed into me whilst I was crossing. Someone with a visual impairment wouldn't stand a chance! Visibility is very poor for both drivers and pedestrians due to the layout and the congestion of traffic on these narrow, cobbled

streets.

At certain times of the day it is particularly bad. Visitors to the area regularly park outside the Carus Centre on the main road or on Sydney street. Drivers visiting the village shop regularly turn around by driving up Graham street, across Albert street and down Sydney street. Drivers stop at the bottom of Sydney street to drop people off at Carus centre and there is the increased traffic from the overflow from the pub when there's a function on. I've seen cars turning into Sydney street, then having to reverse onto the main road because there is already a car on Sydney street coming towards them. Whilst driving up Sydney street I sometimes meet a car trying to turn into Sydney street from Albert street. One of us is required to reverse to let the other through. Also, there are times when it would be impossible for an emergency vehicle to get through.

There are eleven houses on Hargreaves street, some of which have two or three cars, yet this road does not seem to be recognised as a right-of-way on the plan. Delivery vans regularly drive up and down the back of Hargreaves street, as do residents and visitors. If there was an increased flow of traffic from Bowling Green Close, the existing problems would be made much worse.

I notice on the proposed plan that car parking spaces would be offered to three houses in the vicinity. Two of these houses currently have no associated vehicles (one is empty) and the third has three vehicles which are usually parked on Sydney street and Albert street. Therefore, this would have no effect on the number of cars parked, as whenever there's a space, someone else fills it.

There have been many accidents and near-misses over the years and any increase in traffic could result in someone losing their life. One really has to live in this area to fully appreciate the problems we already face on a regular basis.

Although this latest application is for a reduced number of houses, I feel it is my duty to object as the safety of residents and visitors is of paramount importance and I would be devastated if anyone, particularly a child were to be involved in a serious/fatal accident.

Objection Natalie Koncsol Rec – 16/05/2018

Re: Proposed Development in Hoddlesden (planning ref 10/18/0326)

I am writing with regards to the proposed development on the allotments in Hoddlesden. As a Hoddlesden resident who lives close to the proposed development, I am extremely worried for the following reasons:

- 1) Despite the fact that this application is for a reduced number of dwellings compared with the previous unsuccessful application, the fact remains that the additional traffic generated by this proposal would be detrimental to the centre of the village and would be very dangerous. Already cars speed through the village and any increase in the number of vehicles would result in a significantly increased risk of a serious accident. There are regular “near-misses” at the junction of Sydney Street and Queen Street. Moreover, the additional volume of cars would have an **unacceptable impact on the village’s already overcrowded roads.**

- 2) Parking is a huge issue around the village’s terraced streets and the development would exacerbate the problem. Whilst the proposal shows that parking would be provided for the new houses, some households would have additional vehicles and guests, all of whom would end up parking on the terraced streets, **taking the already limited spaces from residents.**

Additionally, when the streets become congested, they frequently become impassable, especially for larger vehicles. Our most serious concern is that emergency vehicles such as **fire engines and ambulances would be unable to access the houses** (and this would include the houses in the proposed development).

- 3) There is still no suitable access to the site. Sydney St, Albert St and Graham St are part of a conservation area with narrow cobbled streets. They were never designed to be through roads for a housing development. Already the junctions of Queen St / Sydney St and Queen St / Graham St regularly experience accidents and near-misses, with cars parked dangerously and visibility poor; the increase in traffic would greatly exacerbate this problem. In addition these roads are already in a very poor state of repair, any additional traffic would cause them to deteriorate even faster.

Furthermore, residents of Hargreaves St are required to reverse out of the lane at the rear of their properties, due to the lack of a turning point. As such, the existing junction of Hargreaves St / Albert St / Sydney St, which has also already experienced accidents, would become **substantially more dangerous and accident-prone.** There are 11 existing dwellings along Hargreaves Street, with approximately 15 vehicles. Some of these are able to park on the lane at the back of Hargreaves Street, but others have to take pot luck on Sydney/Albert/Graham Street. A MAJOR issue for me is the fact that this proposal contains **no acknowledgement whatsoever of the existence of the lane and its current traffic volume.**

It is not at all clear what the arrangement would be for the junction between the lane and Sydney Street. There seems to be a continuation of the pavement right across the lane. This is in my view extremely dangerous, as pedestrians would not always be aware of traffic coming down the lane, as visibility is so poor.

- 4) The proposed balancing pond will be dangerous. The size of the pond and its location make it likely that children would play in it, at serious risk to their lives.

In addition, I am concerned that the balancing pond will not adequately address the **significant drainage issues of the site.** Already the access road to Hargreaves St frequently becomes waterlogged by surface water run off from the allotments site. This in turn causes problems on Sydney St. Development of the site and its being hardscaped would lead to a **massive increase in water run off** and potentially to the flooding of existing houses.

It is also very unclear where the outflow from the balancing pond would go. It would seem to somehow connect to the culvert which runs along the middle of Hoddlesden Millennium Green. This culvert already floods on a regular basis and any additional volume of water would create a very dangerous flooding situation. In addition, as I am sure you are aware, the Green is a Fields in Trust heritage site, and as such, specific approval to achieve the connection would need to be granted.

- 5) Running under Sydney St and Albert St there is a disused railway tunnel that used to serve the mines. Would the existing road structure above the tunnel be strong enough to support heavy construction traffic followed by a significant increase in residential traffic?
- 6) Given the recent discovery of unrecorded mine shafts in the area of the new Darwen Relief Road, surely a mining survey should be undertaken on the site of the proposed

development to rule out any similar surprises, which could well render the development unviable.

- 7) There is already a large surplus of applications to St Paul's Primary School in the village. With the increased population from the development, would children in the village be guaranteed a place at the school?
- 8) In order for the proposed site layout to be implemented, I believe this would necessitate taking land owned by other residents. In particular this applies to the proposed footpath out onto Chapman Road, and the proposed improvements to the junction of Sydney Street and Queen Street. Surely this would not be permitted?
- 9) Once again, the drainage strategy report which accompanies this application is completely invalid as it references a plan which includes access from Chapman Road. This is exactly the same document as was submitted with the previous application, and clearly needs to be updated to reflect the actual plan layout before the application can proceed.

- 10) The application includes an updated transport statement. I would make the following points :
- a. The accident review section on page 14 refers to one recorded accident in 2013, and concludes that this level of accidents would not be considered an issue. I know for a fact that there have been several accidents around the junctions of Sydney Street and Graham Street, including one just a few days ago. The fact that these were not recorded, presumably because the emergency services were not called, does not mean that these should not be taken into consideration.
 - b. The report includes a parking survey which was carried out over a single 3 hour period on a single day. This can hardly be considered representative of the actual situation, and in my view is a totally inadequate snapshot on which to base any planning decision. The report references an appendix A which is supposed to provide the full survey data, but this is missing from the document. Therefore as it stands this report is incomplete and should be re-issued before the application is allowed to proceed.
 - c. In addition, it is not all clear what the analysis of the survey is trying to state. I am assuming that the column labelled “% Cap.” is the % capability of the road in question? If that is the case, then there are anomalies in the analysis, as in the summary the Ranken Arms car park appears to have 133% capability, which is clearly impossible.
 - d. Once again, the transport statement includes details of the Number 33 bus service which are incorrect. In addition it is understood that this bus service is due to be **withdrawn** in June 2018 because of a lack of funding. This will mean that the application site will have **zero public transport access**.
 - e. In summary, the transport statement fails to address the concerns raised in the pre-application responses back in 2015. The statement that Back Hargreaves Street is not affected is completely untrue, and the claim that the impact on Sydney/Albert/Graham Street is sufficiently mitigated to allow accordance with MFS guidance is just not sustainable.

To summarise, the issues with this application which are outlined above, mean that it should not go ahead. The fundamental issue with this application is a lack of suitable vehicular access, as required by the original pre-app responses, which is far from sufficiently mitigated simply because the number of dwellings has been reduced. **There are already significant problems with parking and traffic at the present time**, and if this development were to be approved, this would result in a very much more dangerous situation, one which would inevitably result in even more accidents and potential injury or worse still, loss of life. **I therefore urge you to do the right thing and reject this application.**

Objection Residents of Hoddlesden Rec 18/05/2018

I am writing with regards to the proposed development on the allotments in Hoddlesden. As a Hoddlesden resident who lives close to the proposed development, I am extremely worried for the following reasons:

- 1) Despite the fact that this application is for a reduced number of dwellings compared with the previous unsuccessful application, the fact remains that the additional traffic generated by this proposal would be detrimental to the centre of the village and would be very dangerous. Already cars speed through the village and any increase in the number of vehicles would result in a significantly increased risk of a serious accident. There are regular “near-misses” at the junction of Sydney Street and Queen Street. Moreover, the additional volume of cars would have an **unacceptable impact on the village’s already overcrowded roads.**

- 2) Parking is a huge issue around the village’s terraced streets and the development would exacerbate the problem. Whilst the proposal shows that parking would be provided for the new houses, some households would have additional vehicles and guests, all of whom would end up parking on the terraced streets, **taking the already limited spaces from residents.**

Additionally, when the streets become congested, they frequently become impassable, especially for larger vehicles. Our most serious concern is that emergency vehicles such as **fire engines and ambulances would be unable to access the houses** (and this would include the houses in the proposed development).

- 3) There is still no suitable access to the site. Sydney St, Albert St and Graham St are part of a conservation area with narrow cobbled streets. They were never designed to be through roads for a housing development. Already the junctions of Queen St / Sydney St and Queen St / Graham St regularly experience accidents and near-misses, with cars parked dangerously and visibility poor; the increase in traffic would greatly exacerbate this problem. In addition these roads are already in a very poor state of repair, any additional traffic would cause them to deteriorate even faster.

Furthermore, residents of Hargreaves St are required to reverse out of the lane at the rear of their properties, due to the lack of a turning point. As such, the existing junction of Hargreaves St / Albert St / Sydney St, which has also already experienced accidents, would become **substantially more dangerous and accident-prone.** There are 11 existing dwellings along Hargreaves Street, with approximately 15 vehicles. Some of these are able to park on the lane at the back of Hargreaves Street, but others have to take pot luck on Sydney/Albert/Graham Street. A MAJOR issue for me is the fact that this proposal contains **no acknowledgement whatsoever of the existence of the lane and its current traffic volume.**

It is not at all clear what the arrangement would be for the junction between the lane and Sydney Street. There seems to be a continuation of the pavement right across the lane. This is in my view extremely dangerous, as pedestrians would not always be aware of traffic coming down the lane, as visibility is so poor.

- 4) The proposed balancing pond will be dangerous. The size of the pond and its location make it likely that children would play in it, at serious risk to their lives.

In addition, I am concerned that the balancing pond will not adequately address the **significant drainage issues of the site.** Already the access road to Hargreaves St frequently becomes waterlogged by surface water run off from the allotments site. This in turn causes problems on Sydney St. Development of the site and its being landscaped would lead to a **massive increase in water run off** and potentially to the flooding of existing houses.

It is also very unclear where the outflow from the balancing pond would go. It would seem to somehow connect to the culvert which runs along the middle of Hoddlesden Millennium Green. This culvert already floods on a regular basis and any additional volume of water would create a very dangerous flooding situation. In addition, as I am sure you are aware, the Green is a Fields in Trust heritage site, and as such, specific approval to achieve the connection would need to be granted.

- 5) Running under Sydney St and Albert St there is a disused railway tunnel that used to serve the mines. Would the existing road structure above the tunnel be strong enough to support heavy construction traffic followed by a significant increase in residential traffic?
- 6) Given the recent discovery of unrecorded mine shafts in the area of the new Darwen Relief Road, surely a mining survey should be undertaken on the site of the proposed

development to rule out any similar surprises, which could well render the development unviable.

- 7) There is already a large surplus of applications to St Paul's Primary School in the village. With the increased population from the development, would children in the village be guaranteed a place at the school?
- 8) In order for the proposed site layout to be implemented, I believe this would necessitate taking land owned by other residents. In particular this applies to the proposed footpath out onto Chapman Road, and the proposed improvements to the junction of Sydney Street and Queen Street. Surely this would not be permitted?
- 9) Once again, the drainage strategy report which accompanies this application is completely invalid as it references a plan which includes access from Chapman Road. This is exactly the same document as was submitted with the previous application, and clearly needs to be updated to reflect the actual plan layout before the application can proceed.

- 10) The application includes an updated transport statement. I would make the following points :
- a. The accident review section on page 14 refers to one recorded accident in 2013, and concludes that this level of accidents would not be considered an issue. I know for a fact that there have been several accidents around the junctions of Sydney Street and Graham Street, including one just a few days ago. The fact that these were not recorded, presumably because the emergency services were not called, does not mean that these should not be taken into consideration.
 - b. The report includes a parking survey which was carried out over a single 3 hour period on a single day. This can hardly be considered representative of the actual situation, and in my view is a totally inadequate snapshot on which to base any planning decision. The report references an appendix A which is supposed to provide the full survey data, but this is missing from the document. Therefore as it stands this report is incomplete and should be re-issued before the application is allowed to proceed.
 - c. In addition, it is not all clear what the analysis of the survey is trying to state. I am assuming that the column labelled “% Cap.” is the % capability of the road in question? If that is the case, then there are anomalies in the analysis, as in the summary the Ranken Arms car park appears to have 133% capability, which is clearly impossible.
 - d. Once again, the transport statement includes details of the Number 33 bus service which are incorrect. In addition it is understood that this bus service is due to be withdrawn in June 2018 because of a lack of funding. This will mean that the application site will have zero public transport access.
 - e. In summary, the transport statement fails to address the concerns raised in the pre-application responses back in 2015. The statement that Back Hargreaves Street is not affected is completely untrue, and the claim that the impact on Sydney/Albert/Graham Street is sufficiently mitigated to allow accordance with MFS guidance is just not sustainable.

To summarise, the issues with this application which are outlined above, mean that it should not go ahead. The fundamental issue with this application is a lack of suitable vehicular access, as required by the original pre-app responses, which is far from sufficiently mitigated simply because the number of dwellings has been reduced. **There are already significant problems with parking and traffic at the present time**, and if this development were to be approved, this would result in a very much more dangerous situation, one which would inevitably result in even more accidents and potential injury or worse still, loss of life. **I therefore urge you to do the right thing and reject this application.**

Objection Sayver Koncsol Rec – 16/05/2018

Re: Proposed Development in Hoddlesden (planning ref 10/18/0326)

I am writing with regards to the proposed development on the allotments in Hoddlesden. As a Hoddlesden resident who lives close to the proposed development, I am extremely worried for the following reasons:

- 1) Despite the fact that this application is for a reduced number of dwellings compared with the previous unsuccessful application, the fact remains that the additional traffic generated by this proposal would be detrimental to the centre of the village and would be very dangerous. Already cars speed through the village and any increase in the number of vehicles would result in a significantly increased risk of a serious accident. There are regular “near-misses” at the junction of Sydney Street and Queen Street. Moreover, the additional volume of cars would have an **unacceptable impact on the village’s already overcrowded roads.**

- 2) Parking is a huge issue around the village’s terraced streets and the development would exacerbate the problem. Whilst the proposal shows that parking would be provided for the new houses, some households would have additional vehicles and guests, all of whom would end up parking on the terraced streets, **taking the already limited spaces from residents.**

Additionally, when the streets become congested, they frequently become impassable, especially for larger vehicles. Our most serious concern is that emergency vehicles such as **fire engines and ambulances would be unable to access the houses** (and this would include the houses in the proposed development).

- 3) There is still no suitable access to the site. Sydney St, Albert St and Graham St are part of a conservation area with narrow cobbled streets. **They were never designed to be through roads for a housing development.** Already the junctions of Queen St / Sydney St and Queen St / Graham St regularly experience accidents and near-misses, with cars parked dangerously and visibility poor; the increase in traffic would greatly exacerbate this problem. In addition these roads are already in a very poor state of repair, any additional traffic would cause them to deteriorate even faster.

Furthermore, residents of Hargreaves St are required to reverse out of the lane at the rear of their properties, due to the lack of a turning point. As such, the existing junction of Hargreaves St / Albert St / Sydney St, which has also already experienced accidents, would become **substantially more dangerous and accident-prone.** There are 11 existing dwellings along Hargreaves Street, with approximately 15 vehicles. Some of these are able to park on the lane at the back of Hargreaves Street, but others have to take pot luck on Sydney/Albert/Graham Street. A MAJOR issue for me is the fact that this proposal contains **no acknowledgement whatsoever of the existence of the lane and its current traffic volume.**

It is not at all clear what the arrangement would be for the junction between the lane and Sydney Street. There seems to be a continuation of the pavement right across the lane. This is in my view extremely dangerous, as pedestrians would not always be aware of traffic coming down the lane, as visibility is so poor.

- 4) The proposed balancing pond will be dangerous. The size of the pond and its location make it likely that children would play in it, at serious risk to their lives.

In addition, I am concerned that the balancing pond will not adequately address the significant drainage issues of the site. Already the access road to Hargreaves St frequently becomes waterlogged by surface water run off from the allotments site. This in turn causes problems on Sydney St. Development of the site and its being hardscaped would lead to a massive increase in water run off and potentially to the flooding of existing houses.

It is also very unclear where the outflow from the balancing pond would go. It would seem to somehow connect to the culvert which runs along the middle of Hoddlesden Millennium Green. This culvert already floods on a regular basis and any additional volume of water would create a very dangerous flooding situation. In addition, as I am sure you are aware, the Green is a Fields in Trust heritage site, and as such, specific approval to achieve the connection would need to be granted.

- 5) Running under Sydney St and Albert St there is a disused railway tunnel that used to serve the mines. Would the existing road structure above the tunnel be strong enough to support heavy construction traffic followed by a significant increase in residential traffic?
- 6) Given the recent discovery of unrecorded mine shafts in the area of the new Darwen Relief Road, surely a mining survey should be undertaken on the site of the proposed

development to rule out any similar surprises, which could well render the development unviable.

- 7) There is already a large surplus of applications to St Paul's Primary School in the village. With the increased population from the development, would children in the village be guaranteed a place at the school?
 - 8) In order for the proposed site layout to be implemented, I believe this would necessitate taking land owned by other residents. In particular this applies to the proposed footpath out onto Chapman Road, and the proposed improvements to the junction of Sydney Street and Queen Street. Surely this would not be permitted?
 - 9) Once again, the drainage strategy report which accompanies this application is completely invalid as it references a plan which includes access from Chapman Road. This is exactly the same document as was submitted with the previous application, and clearly needs to be updated to reflect the actual plan layout before the application can proceed.
- 10) The application includes an updated transport statement. I would make the following points :
- a. The accident review section on page 14 refers to one recorded accident in 2013, and concludes that this level of accidents would not be considered an issue. I know for a fact that there have been several accidents around the junctions of Sydney Street and Graham Street, including one just a few days ago. The fact that these were not recorded, presumably because the emergency services were not called, does not mean that these should not be taken into consideration.
 - b. The report includes a parking survey which was carried out over a single 3 hour period on a single day. This can hardly be considered representative of the actual situation, and in my view is a totally inadequate snapshot on which to base any planning decision. The report references an appendix A which is supposed to provide the full survey data, but this is missing from the document. Therefore as it stands this report is incomplete and should be re-issued before the application is allowed to proceed.

- c. In addition, it is not all clear what the analysis of the survey is trying to state. I am assuming that the column labelled “% Cap.” is the % capability of the road in question? If that is the case, then there are anomalies in the analysis, as in the summary the Ranken Arms car park appears to have 133% capability, which is clearly impossible.
- d. Once again, the transport statement includes details of the Number 33 bus service which are incorrect. In addition it is understood that this bus service is due to be **withdrawn** in June 2018 because of a lack of funding. This will mean that the application site will have **zero public transport access**.
- e. In summary, the transport statement fails to address the concerns raised in the pre-application responses back in 2015. The statement that Back Hargreaves Street is not affected is completely untrue, and the claim that the impact on Sydney/Albert/Graham Street is sufficiently mitigated to allow accordance with MFS guidance is just not sustainable.

To summarise, the issues with this application which are outlined above, mean that it should not go ahead. The fundamental issue with this application is a lack of suitable vehicular access, as required by the original pre-app responses, which is far from sufficiently mitigated simply because the number of dwellings has been reduced. **There are already significant problems with parking and traffic at the present time**, and if this development were to be approved, this would result in a very much more dangerous situation, one which would inevitably result in even more accidents and potential injury or worse still, loss of life. **I therefore urge you to do the right thing and reject this application.**

Re: Proposed Development in Hoddlesden (planning ref 10/18/0326)

I am writing with regards to the proposed development on the allotments in Hoddlesden. As a Hoddlesden resident who lives close to the proposed development, I am extremely worried for the following reasons:

- 1) Despite the fact that this application is for a reduced number of dwellings compared with the previous unsuccessful application, the fact remains that the additional traffic generated by this proposal would be detrimental to the centre of the village and would be very dangerous. Already cars speed through the village and any increase in the number of vehicles would result in a significantly increased risk of a serious accident. There are regular “near-misses” at the junction of Sydney Street and Queen Street. Moreover, the additional volume of cars would have an **unacceptable impact on the village’s already overcrowded roads.**

- 2) Parking is a huge issue around the village’s terraced streets and the development would exacerbate the problem. Whilst the proposal shows that parking would be provided for the new houses, some households would have additional vehicles and guests, all of whom would end up parking on the terraced streets, **taking the already limited spaces from residents.**

Additionally, when the streets become congested, they frequently become impassable, especially for larger vehicles. Our most serious concern is that emergency vehicles such as **fire engines and ambulances would be unable to access the houses** (and this would include the houses in the proposed development).

- 3) There is still no suitable access to the site. Sydney St, Albert St and Graham St are part of a conservation area with narrow cobbled streets. They were never designed to be through roads for a housing development. Already the junctions of Queen St / Sydney St and Queen St / Graham St regularly experience accidents and near-misses, with cars parked dangerously and visibility poor; the increase in traffic would greatly exacerbate this problem. In addition these roads are already in a very poor state of repair, any additional traffic would cause them to deteriorate even faster.

Furthermore, residents of Hargreaves St are required to reverse out of the lane at the rear of their properties, due to the lack of a turning point. As such, the existing junction of Hargreaves St / Albert St / Sydney St, which has also already experienced accidents, would become **substantially more dangerous and accident-prone.** There are 11 existing dwellings along Hargreaves Street, with approximately 15 vehicles. Some of these are able to park on the lane at the back of Hargreaves Street, but others have to take pot luck on Sydney/Albert/Graham Street. A MAJOR issue for me is the fact that this proposal contains **no acknowledgement whatsoever of the existence of the lane and its current traffic volume.**

It is not at all clear what the arrangement would be for the junction between the lane and Sydney Street. There seems to be a continuation of the pavement right across the lane. This is in my view extremely dangerous, as pedestrians would not always be aware of traffic coming down the lane, as visibility is so poor.

- 4) The proposed balancing pond will be dangerous. The size of the pond and its location make it likely that children would play in it, at serious risk to their lives.

In addition, I am concerned that the balancing pond will not adequately address the **significant drainage issues of the site.** Already the access road to Hargreaves St frequently becomes waterlogged by surface water run off from the allotments site. This in turn causes problems on Sydney St. Development of the site and its being hardscaped would lead to a **massive increase in water run off** and potentially to the flooding of existing houses.

It is also very unclear where the outflow from the balancing pond would go. It would seem to somehow connect to the culvert which runs along the middle of Hoddlesden Millennium Green. This culvert already floods on a regular basis and any additional volume of water would create a very dangerous flooding situation. In addition, as I am sure you are aware, the Green is a Fields in Trust heritage site, and as such, specific approval to achieve the connection would need to be granted.

- 5) Running under Sydney St and Albert St there is a disused railway tunnel that used to serve the mines. Would the existing road structure above the tunnel be strong enough to support heavy construction traffic followed by a significant increase in residential traffic?
- 6) Given the recent discovery of unrecorded mine shafts in the area of the new Darwen Relief Road, surely a mining survey should be undertaken on the site of the proposed

development to rule out any similar surprises, which could well render the development unviable.

- 7) There is already a large surplus of applications to St Paul's Primary School in the village. With the increased population from the development, would children in the village be guaranteed a place at the school?
- 8) In order for the proposed site layout to be implemented, I believe this would necessitate taking land owned by other residents. In particular this applies to the proposed footpath out onto Chapman Road, and the proposed improvements to the junction of Sydney Street and Queen Street. Surely this would not be permitted?
- 9) Once again, the drainage strategy report which accompanies this application is completely invalid as it references a plan which includes access from Chapman Road. This is exactly the same document as was submitted with the previous application, and clearly needs to be updated to reflect the actual plan layout before the application can proceed.

10) The application includes an updated transport statement. I would make the following points :

- a. The accident review section on page 14 refers to one recorded accident in 2013, and concludes that this level of accidents would not be considered an issue. I know for a fact that there have been several accidents around the junctions of Sydney Street and Graham Street, including one just a few days ago. The fact that these were not recorded, presumably because the emergency services were not called, does not mean that these should not be taken into consideration.
- b. The report includes a parking survey which was carried out over a single 3 hour period on a single day. This can hardly be considered representative of the actual situation, and in my view is a totally inadequate snapshot on which to base any planning decision. The report references an appendix A which is supposed to provide the full survey data, but this is missing from the document. Therefore as it stands this report is incomplete and should be re-issued before the application is allowed to proceed.
- c. In addition, it is not all clear what the analysis of the survey is trying to state. I am assuming that the column labelled "% Cap." is the % capability of the road in question? If that is the case, then there are anomalies in the analysis, as in the summary the Ranken Arms car park appears to have 133% capability, which is clearly impossible.
- d. Once again, the transport statement includes details of the Number 33 bus service which are incorrect. In addition it is understood that this bus service is due to be **withdrawn** in June 2018 because of a lack of funding. This will mean that the application site will have **zero public transport access**.

- e. In summary, the transport statement fails to address the concerns raised in the pre-application responses back in 2015. The statement that Back Hargreaves Street is not affected is completely untrue, and the claim that the impact on Sydney/Albert/Graham Street is sufficiently mitigated to allow accordance with MFS guidance is just not sustainable.

To summarise, the issues with this application which are outlined above, mean that it should not go ahead. The fundamental issue with this application is a lack of suitable vehicular access, as required by the original pre-app responses, which is far from sufficiently mitigated simply because the number of dwellings has been reduced. **There are already significant problems with parking and traffic at the present time**, and if this development were to be approved, this would result in a very much more dangerous situation, one which would inevitably result in even more accidents and potential injury or worse still, loss of life. **I therefore urge you to do the right thing and reject this application.**

Objection W R Livesey, 27 Carus Avenue, Darwen. Rec – 17/05/2018

Re: Proposed Development in Hoddlesden (planning ref 10/18/0326)

I am writing with regards to the proposed development on the allotments in Hoddlesden. As a Hoddlesden resident who lives close to the proposed development, I am extremely worried for the following reasons:

- 1) Despite the fact that this application is for a reduced number of dwellings compared with the previous unsuccessful application, the fact remains that the additional traffic generated by this proposal would be detrimental to the centre of the village and would be very dangerous. Already cars speed through the village and any increase in the number of vehicles would result in a significantly increased risk of a serious accident. There are regular “near-misses” at the junction of Sydney Street and Queen Street. Moreover, the additional volume of cars would have an **unacceptable impact on the village’s already overcrowded roads.**

- 2) Parking is a huge issue around the village’s terraced streets and the development would exacerbate the problem. Whilst the proposal shows that parking would be provided for the new houses, some households would have additional vehicles and guests, all of whom would end up parking on the terraced streets, **taking the already limited spaces from residents.**

Additionally, when the streets become congested, they frequently become impassable, especially for larger vehicles. Our most serious concern is that emergency vehicles such as **fire engines and ambulances would be unable to access the houses** (and this would include the houses in the proposed development).

- 3) There is still no suitable access to the site. Sydney St, Albert St and Graham St are part of a conservation area with narrow cobbled streets. **They were never designed to be through roads for a housing development.** Already the junctions of Queen St / Sydney St and Queen St / Graham St regularly experience accidents and near-misses, with cars parked dangerously and visibility poor; the increase in traffic would greatly exacerbate this problem. In addition these roads are already in a very poor state of repair, any additional traffic would cause them to deteriorate even faster.

Furthermore, residents of Hargreaves St are required to reverse out of the lane at the rear of their properties, due to the lack of a turning point. As such, the existing junction of Hargreaves St / Albert St / Sydney St, which has also already experienced accidents, would become **substantially more dangerous and accident-prone.** There are 11 existing dwellings along Hargreaves Street, with approximately 15 vehicles. Some of these are able to park on the lane at the back of Hargreaves Street, but others have to take pot luck on Sydney/Albert/Graham Street. A MAJOR issue for me is the fact that this proposal contains **no acknowledgement whatsoever of the existence of the lane and its current traffic volume.**

It is not at all clear what the arrangement would be for the junction between the lane and Sydney Street. There seems to be a continuation of the pavement right across the lane. This is in my view extremely dangerous, as pedestrians would not always be aware of traffic coming down the lane, as visibility is so poor.

- 4) The proposed balancing pond will be dangerous. The size of the pond and its location make it likely that children would play in it, at serious risk to their lives.

In addition, I am concerned that the balancing pond will not adequately address the **significant drainage issues of the site**. Already the access road to Hargreaves St frequently becomes waterlogged by surface water run off from the allotments site. This in turn causes problems on Sydney St. Development of the site and its being hardscaped would lead to a **massive increase in water run off** and potentially to the flooding of existing houses.

It is also very unclear where the outflow from the balancing pond would go. It would seem to somehow connect to the culvert which runs along the middle of Hoddlesden Millennium Green. This culvert already floods on a regular basis and any additional volume of water would create a very dangerous flooding situation. In addition, as I am sure you are aware, the Green is a Fields in Trust heritage site, and as such, specific approval to achieve the connection would need to be granted.

- 5) Running under Sydney St and Albert St there is a disused railway tunnel that used to serve the mines. Would the existing road structure above the tunnel be strong enough to support heavy construction traffic followed by a significant increase in residential traffic?
- 6) Given the recent discovery of unrecorded mine shafts in the area of the new Darwen Relief Road, surely a mining survey should be undertaken on the site of the proposed

development to rule out any similar surprises, which could well render the development unviable.

- 7) There is already a large surplus of applications to St Paul's Primary School in the village. With the increased population from the development, would children in the village be guaranteed a place at the school?
 - 8) In order for the proposed site layout to be implemented, I believe this would necessitate taking land owned by other residents. In particular this applies to the proposed footpath out onto Chapman Road, and the proposed improvements to the junction of Sydney Street and Queen Street. Surely this would not be permitted?
 - 9) Once again, the drainage strategy report which accompanies this application is completely invalid as it references a plan which includes access from Chapman Road. This is exactly the same document as was submitted with the previous application, and clearly needs to be updated to reflect the actual plan layout before the application can proceed.
- 10) The application includes an updated transport statement. I would make the following points :
- a. The accident review section on page 14 refers to one recorded accident in 2013, and concludes that this level of accidents would not be considered an issue. I know for a fact that there have been several accidents around the junctions of Sydney Street and Graham Street, including one just a few days ago. The fact that these were not recorded, presumably because the emergency services were not called, does not mean that these should not be taken into consideration.
 - b. The report includes a parking survey which was carried out over a single 3 hour period on a single day. This can hardly be considered representative of the actual situation, and in my view is a totally inadequate snapshot on which to base any planning decision. The report references an appendix A which is supposed to provide the full survey data, but this is missing from the document. Therefore as it stands this report is incomplete and should be re-issued before the application is allowed to proceed.

- c. In addition, it is not all clear what the analysis of the survey is trying to state. I am assuming that the column labelled “% Cap.” is the % capability of the road in question? If that is the case, then there are anomalies in the analysis, as in the summary the Ranken Arms car park appears to have 133% capability, which is clearly impossible.
- d. Once again, the transport statement includes details of the Number 33 bus service which are incorrect. In addition it is understood that this bus service is due to be **withdrawn** in June 2018 because of a lack of funding. This will mean that the application site will have **zero public transport access.**
- e. In summary, the transport statement fails to address the concerns raised in the pre-application responses back in 2015. The statement that Back Hargreaves Street is not affected is completely untrue, and the claim that the impact on Sydney/Albert/Graham Street is sufficiently mitigated to allow accordance with MFS guidance is just not sustainable.

To summarise, the issues with this application which are outlined above, mean that it should not go ahead. The fundamental issue with this application is a lack of suitable vehicular access, as required by the original pre-app responses, which is far from sufficiently mitigated simply because the number of dwellings has been reduced. **There are already significant problems with parking and traffic at the present time,** and if this development were to be approved, this would result in a very much more dangerous situation, one which would inevitably result in even more accidents and potential injury or worse still, loss of life. **I therefore urge you to do the right thing and reject this application.**

Objection Mrs H McIlveen. Rec – 09/02/2018

Dear Mr Mr Prescott and Mr Hickey

Re: Proposed Development in Hoddlesden (planning ref 10/18/0326)

I am writing with regards to the proposed development on the allotments in Hoddlesden. I am not against some development of the land and the estate seems to be well designed and in keeping with the area. However, I am astounded yet again that the applicant feels that there is a viable access to the development from Sydney street. As a Hoddlesden resident who lives close to the proposed development, I am extremely worried about the impact this development would have on the village. There are already significant road safety issues in this area and any increase in traffic would exacerbate these problems.

My main concern is for the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and drivers. I regularly walk to and from the local school with two children walking at the side of a pram. In order to cross at the zebra crossing (which is the only safe place to cross such a busy road) I am required to cross Albert street and/or Sydney street. I either then walk to the bottom of Sydney street and turn left to walk on the zig-zag signs on the main road (there is no pavement here) towards the zebra crossing. Or, I walk on the pavement in front of the Ranken Arms and across the Ranken Arms car park, being very careful to avoid reversing cars, to get to the crossing. During my journey to and from school, I am sometimes required to dodge cars reversing out of Hargreaves street into Bowling Green Close and cars coming down Bowling Green Close and across Albert street into Sydney street. Only the other day, a young cyclist was crossing the bottom of Back Hargreaves street and narrowly avoided being hit by a car travelling up Sydney street. I also had to step back on to the main road on Thursday as a car nearly reversed into me whilst I was crossing. Someone with a visual impairment wouldn't stand a chance! Visibility is very poor for both drivers and pedestrians due to the layout and the congestion of traffic on these narrow, cobbled

streets.

At certain times of the day it is particularly bad. Visitors to the area regularly park outside the Carus Centre on the main road or on Sydney street. Drivers visiting the village shop regularly turn around by driving up Graham street, across Albert street and down Sydney street. Drivers stop at the bottom of Sydney street to drop people off at Carus centre and there is the increased traffic from the overflow from the pub when there's a function on. I've seen cars turning into Sydney street, then having to reverse onto the main road because there is already a car on Sydney street coming towards them. Whilst driving up Sydney street I sometimes meet a car trying to turn into Sydney street from Albert street. One of us is required to reverse to let the other through. Also, there are times when it would be impossible for an emergency vehicle to get through.

There are eleven houses on Hargreaves street, some of which have two or three cars, yet this road does not seem to be recognised as a right-of-way on the plan. Delivery vans regularly drive up and down the back of Hargreaves street, as do residents and visitors. If there was an increased flow of traffic from Bowling Green Close, the existing problems would be made much worse.

I notice on the proposed plan that car parking spaces would be offered to three houses in the vicinity. Two of these houses currently have no associated vehicles (one is empty) and the third has three vehicles which are usually parked on Sydney street and Albert street. Therefore, this would have no effect on the number of cars parked, as whenever there's a space, someone else fills it.

There have been many accidents and near-misses over the years and any increase in traffic could result in someone losing their life. One really has to live in this area to fully appreciate the problems we already face on a regular basis.

Although this latest application is for a reduced number of houses, I feel it is my duty to object as the safety of residents and visitors is of paramount importance and I would be devastated if anyone, particularly a child were to be involved in a serious/fatal accident.

Support Mr Allan Millward, 8 Carus Avenue, Darwen Rec – 18/05/2018

Dear Mr Prescott/Mr Hickey

RE DEVELOPMENT TO THE REAR OF CARUS AVENUE HODDLESDEN application number 10/18/0326

I recently received an objection letter through my door. It asked me to sign the objection for the new proposed housing development to the rear of my property. Surely these letters cannot be considered as credible objections as they are the objections of one man (I have enclosed a copy for you to see).

I would like to point out that the allotments to the rear of my property have been in decline for decades and they were a real eyesore. These large executive homes can only enhance the village by bringing more affluent people to the area and it will certainly tidy up this very unsightly allotment site.

I strongly support this development.

Objection Mrs E Keough, 35 Bayne Street, Darwen. Rec 18/05/2018

I have just read a letter that is circulating around the village asking people to sign it in objection to the planning application for houses at the rear of the Ranken Norms Public House.

One of the points raised in the letter was oversubscription to the village school. I live on Bayne Street near to St Paul's Primary School and I must say that the traffic

problem to and from the school is a major problem mainly because people from out of the Village having to drop their children off by car.

It is my view that if there was more children attending the school within walking distance this would result in less car journeys to and from the school. On this point I am expressing my support for the development.

Support Mrs S Marshall, 63A Glenshiels Avenue, Darwen Rec – 18/05/2018

Re Planning Application 10/18/0324

There is an objection letter that has been distributed around the village of Hoddlesden and I disagree with the points raised in the letter.

- 1) Accidents at the junctions of Sydney Street and Graham Street. I have lived in this area since 1977 and I have never heard of any accidents at these junctions, not even minor ones.*
- 2) Congestion around Sydney Street, Graham Street and Hargreaves Street, This development is creating extra car parking for some of the residents around these terraced streets.*

I would like to express being in favour of this development as I think the village is very short of larger executive homes. I would also point out that the new footpath to the Millennium Green will be most beneficial to people like myself living on the estate above the proposed development site.

I hope my points are took into consideration when making you final decision and not just by masses of the same letter signed by anyone.

Support Mrs Susan Howarth, 11 Pleasant View, Darwen. Rec – 18/05/2018

Dear Sirs

I have received a letter that was posted through my door asking to object to the above planning application.

Having looked at the architects drawings it appears that this development is creating off road parking for the use of the residents around Sydney Street/Hargreaves Street and to me this must only be a good thing and would like to support this development. I would also like to add that I think it enhances the area and I like the idea of creating a new walk way to the Millennium Green.

Thank you for your time to read this.

Support Mrs McCluskey Rec 16/05/2018

LETTER OF SUPPORT

In reference to the above development/planning application.

I would like to show my support to the proposal with the following five points to be agreed as part of the planning.

I own a property on Albert St & everyone knows that the car parking at present is very restricted, especially in the evening.

That said, I definitely wouldn't want to see yellow lines on the 3 cobbled streets of - Albert St , Sydney & Graham St. As these streets are in the conservation area the character cobbles should remain, as part of the heritage of the village.

As I understand from the plans submitted, the developer has made provision for 11 car parking spaces, plus 4 new garages, behind Hargreaves St. Can I suggest these are for Hargreaves St only This would free up space in front of mine & the other properties on Albert St.

Looking at the plans, it appears that the developer has also made provision for pavements & 2 footpaths.

This would be very welcome. Far too many new estates have no provisions for children walking to school & the lack of pavements makes many new developments dangerous with cars on the highways with no pavements. I'm pleased to see the foot path from Chapman Rd on to the new development also.

The new footpath directly onto the millennium green area is an enhancement to the original estate on Chapman Rd, bringing green public space nearer.

Studying the plans it looks like all houses have private parking provisions for at least two vehicles, this again is welcomed.

With the above points in mind I would have no hesitation in welcoming the new 14 house development behind Hargreaves Rd & Chapman Rd Hoddlesden.
