

Application Number:	2011/637	Application Type:	Full
Proposal:	Erection of 82 houses, including new access roads from Rockcliffe Road and Grafton Villas	Location:	Land off Rockcliffe Road / Grafton Villas, Bacup
Report of:	Planning Unit Manager	Status:	For Publication
Report to:	Development Control Committee	Date:	17 April 2012
Applicant:	Barnfield Construction Ltd	Determination Expiry Date:	18 April 2012
Agent:	Capita Symonds		

Contact Officer:	Neil Birtles	Telephone:	01706-238645
Email:	neilbirtles@rossendalebc.gov.uk		

REASON FOR REPORTING	Tick Box
Outside Officer Scheme of Delegation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member Call-In Name of Member: Reason for Call-In:	<input type="checkbox"/>
3 or more objections received	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please state):	MAJOR

HUMAN RIGHTS

The relevant provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 and the European Convention on Human Rights have been taken into account in the preparation of this report, particularly the implications arising from the following rights:-

Article 8

The right to respect for private and family life, home and correspondence.

Article 1 of Protocol 1

The right of peaceful enjoyment of possessions and protection of property.

1. RECOMMENDATION

Subsequent to publication of the Agenda for this Committee the Applicant agreed to make a planning contribution of £147,000 towards addressing outstanding issues on this application. Furthermore, the Applicant advised that the agreement they have with Great Places Housing Association necessitates that work on construction of their 25 units commence on-site by the first week in May 2012 and be completed by March 31 2013.

That Committee consider the Report below and be minded to grant Planning Permission subject to a Legal Agreement(s) with the Council first being entered into in order to secure delivery of the Affordable Housing and a planning contribution of £147,000 and the Conditions set out in Section 10.

2. SITE

This application relates to a site which is located to the south of Bacup town centre, between the A681 Market Street, the A671 Rochdale Road and the A6066 New Line. It can presently be entered by people on foot from both New Line and Rockcliffe Road via a Public Footpath that crosses the site. For those in vehicles the site can be entered from Rochdale Road via Rockcliffe Road. However, at present the vehicular traffic visiting the site is most likely to enter Rockcliffe Road from Market Street, before passing through an essentially residential area along River Street/Bold Street/Grafton Villas.

The site is of approximately 3.4 hectares in area and is of irregular shape, and is bounded :

- to the North by houses that front Grafton Villas, bungalows on Anderson Close and long-standing industrial premises at the end of River Street;
- to the West by the River Irwell and the backs of extensive industrial premises;
- to the East by Rockcliffe Road, a garage-court & housing served off Pine Street, a field and the grounds of St Saviours Community Primary School; &
- to the South by a flat/overgrown area of land formerly occupied by a railway line and beneath which runs a stream called Trough Syke, beyond which the land rises up towards New Line.

Whilst it can be said that the site slopes down from Rockcliffe Road in the east towards the western and southern boundaries, it does not do so in a uniform way. From Rockcliffe Road and the garage-court & housing served off Pine Street the site slopes down steeply to a more gently-sloping plateau that extends from the dwellings on Grafton Villas & Anderson Close to a steeply-sloping bank down to the flat land formerly occupied by the railway line beyond the southern boundary. This plateau is bounded to the west by a steeply-sloping bank on a NE-SW axis, at the base of which is again a gently-sloping plateau that extends to the south of the industrial premises at the end of River Street and alongside the River Irwell.

Public Footpath No 486 allows pedestrians to walk from Rockcliffe Road down the eastern boundary of the site as far as the grounds of the School before cutting across the site towards the south-western boundary of the site; the path continues on to New Line after passing through a short tunnel situated just beyond the site boundary (the railway line once bridging over it). One public sewer cuts across the site having passed down Verax Street and between the bungalows that front Anderson Close on a N-S axis, whilst another runs from the end of Anderson Close towards the River Irwell on an E-W axis.

The site lies within the Urban Boundary of Bacup, the Rossendale District Local Plan (adopted in 1995) allocating the bulk of it for residential development, with the fringes to be retained as Greenlands. A small part of the land allocated for residential development has been built-out, occupied by houses and bungalows at the end of Grafton Villas and fronting Anderson Close. The Local Plan has now been replaced by the Core Strategy and has retained protection for Greenlands.

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

2004/143 Erection of 90 houses

Permission was granted for the erection of 90 houses on the site, but it has now become time-expired.

To comprise of 23 2-bedroomed units, with the rest to be of 3 or 4 bedrooms, the approved layout proposed the erection of largely 2-storey linked-detached and 2-storey terraced houses, to be

served by roads extending from Grafton Villas and Anderson Close. A landscaped margin extending completely around the eastern/southern/western boundaries of the site was intended, broadened in two places, to accommodate : 1) the public footpath where it departs from the eastern boundary to cross the site; & 2) to stand new housing away from the party-boundary with the industrial premises at the end of River Street & provide a riverside footpath capable of extension to link the site to River Street. The layout also proposed fingers of landscaping that extend into the site from the landscaped-boundaries to create 'pockets' of housing, the largest of these public open spaces broadly aligned with the steeply-sloping bank between the two plateaus.

In accordance with the Officer Recommendation, at its meeting on 10 July 2006 Committee decided that, despite the housing oversupply situation within the Borough, the circumstances existed to warrant the grant of permission given the regenerative benefits that would accrue from development of this site within the Urban Boundary of Bacup and the boundary of the emerging Bacup, Stacksteads & Britannia AAP. The submitted scheme was considered to propose areas of open space to adequately compensate for loss of land defined as Greenlands, and would not unduly affect highway safety, visual or neighbour amenity or any other material planning consideration.

Thus, Permission was granted subject to Conditions and a Legal Agreement being entered into that required : 5 of the 90 dwellings as 'affordable housing' and payments of £40,000 to address Transport Accessibility issues and £104,000 to enable the Council to adopt and maintain the on-site areas of open space to be provided.

2008/83 - Erection of 80 houses

This application proposed the erection of 80 houses (comprising 2 of 2 bedrooms, 46 of 3 bedrooms & 32 of 4 bedrooms), of which 5 were to be provided as 'affordable housing'. To be served by roads extending from Grafton Villas and Anderson Close, the scheme proposes that the houses be of more varied type/height and would have resulted in built-development that was not so obviously broken-up into 'pockets' by fingers of landscaping that project into the site from a landscape belt that extended so completely around the eastern/southern/western boundaries of the site. There were instead to be three parcels of open space each located adjacent to a site boundary. The applicant was offering to pay to the Council £40,000 to address Transport Accessibility issues and £104,000 to enable the Council to adopt and maintain the on-site areas of open space to be provided.

This application was due to be considered at the meeting of the Development Control Committee in July 2008. However, prior to consideration of the published report recommending refusal of the proposal the application was withdrawn by the Applicant.

2010/115 To extend the time limit by which implementation of Planning Permission 2004/143 (for erection of 90 dwellings) must commence

In order that Local Planning Authorities could better plan, manage and monitor development the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 amended Section 91 of the Town & County Planning Act 1990 so as to reduce the duration of Planning Permissions generally granted from 5 years to 3 years. In light of the present economic downturn, on 1 October 2009 an amendment to the Town & Country Planning (General Procedure) Order came in to force enabling an application to be submitted seeking a time extension in respect of a permission granted before this date and which had not lapsed at the time of the new submission.

Recognising that it would not wish to commence implementation of Planning Permission 2004/143 before its expiry date, Barnfield Construction submitted this application seeking to extend the date for commencement of development.

Government guidance makes it clear that the Council is not bound to grant approval to such an application : *“This process is not a rubber stamp. LPAs may refuse applications to extend the time limit for permissions where changes in the development plan or other relevant material considerations indicate the proposal should no longer be treated favourably”*.

In this instance Officers considered it appropriate in principle to extend the date by which the previously-permitted development must be commenced to 5 years from the date at which Planning Permission 2004/143 was permitted.

After consultation with the Council’s Regeneration Unit and LCC (Highways), and having regard to the economic climate at that time and the limited duration of the permission to be issued, it was concluded that the Affordable Housing requirement and sum of £40,000 to be paid to address Transport Accessibility issues did not need to be modified. With respect to Open Space, the Council’s Operations Manager was no longer so willing to adopt responsibility for future maintenance of open spaces that did not contain equipped play areas/formal playing pitches. Accordingly, Officers considered it desirable for the S.106 Obligation to be amended so as not to require the payment of the commuted sum of £104,310, but the provisions of the Obligation and Conditions of the Planning Permission be so amended that the intended on-site Public Open Space was still provided and arrangements put in place for its future maintenance other than by the Council.

Following consultation with the Chair, permission was granted on this basis.

Accordingly, this permission could still have been commenced until 3 April 2012 and would have yielded 90 houses, of which 5 would be ‘affordable housing’, and have triggered the need for payment of £40k to address transport accessibility issues.

4. THE PROPOSAL

The current proposal would yield 82 houses, to comprise of : 13 2-bedroomed units, 61 of 3-bedrooms and 8 of 4-bedrooms. Although there is to be one detached dwelling, the rest are to be provided as semi-detached properties or in short terraces of 3 to 5 dwellings.

The proposed scheme departs most radically from those previously submitted and approved in its access arrangements. Whilst previous schemes have proposed that all the new houses be served off Rockcliffe Road via River Street/Bold Street/Grafton Villas/Anderson Close, the current layout proposes a loop-road that also enables houses to be served off a newly-constructed road that connects directly to Rockcliffe Road at the north-eastern corner of the site. This new road, descending at quite a steep gradient from Rockcliffe Road, will not initially be fronted by houses. It will initially require construction of a retaining wall to its north side to support it, this retaining wall then extending on a NE-SW axis across the end of a short cul-de-sac to be formed off Anderson Close before running to the rear of other houses being proposed. Another retaining wall is proposed towards the side of the river. Nevertheless gradients elsewhere across the site mean that some of the dwellings to be provided on the site are to be split-level.

The proposed scheme differs from those previously also in that it is proposing a significantly greater amount of the proposed units as Affordable Housing. The Applicant has indicated that 25 of the 3-bedroomed houses are to be taken by Great Places Housing Group as social-rented housing, which equates to 30% of the total number of units. Furthermore, the Applicant has indicated that these dwellings would be in the first construction phase.

The Applicant is proposing essentially 5 different house types be used across the site, varying from 1-storey to 2-storey/3-storey split-level houses, to have grey-tiled roofs and, for the most part, stone-clad front elevations, though with significant areas of render to other elevations. Each of the houses will be setback from the road serving it in order that it may have both a front and a rear garden. Each of the houses will have the facility for not less than 2 cars to park clear of the highway, some of the houses types provides 1 space within their integral garage.

The scheme proposes the retention of the Public Footpath which crosses the site on its existing alignment. It proposes 3 main areas of open space, each of a siting / form that will make them of some ornamental value, none with play equipment / significant play value. The three areas are as follows : 1) narrow strips of land to each side of the new road to descend directly from Rockcliffe Road; 2) a strip to run between the loop-road and the river; & 3) a wedge of land sloping down from the loop-road to land to the south of the application site formerly occupied by the railway line but now naturally re-vegetated.

The Planning Support Statement and Design & Access Statement advise that development of the site presents a number of challenges - not least the topography of the site and difficulties in accessing it - and these have dictated to a significant extent the proposed layout.

The Applicant has further advised that the intention is to :

- Construct the new houses and their boundary treatments in accordance with Secure by Design principles (the affordable housing in any case requiring this): &
- Construct the new roads with a view to passing them to LCC Highways for adoption and future maintenance.
- Enter into a Legal Agreement with the Council to ensure delivery of the Affordable Housing and payment of £147,000 to be expended by the Council on provision of off-site highway /access improvements, play equipment/open space, etc.

The application is also accompanied by :

- A Transport Assessment
- A Civil Engineering Strategy
- Flood Risk Assessment
- Ground Condition Assessment
- Wildlife Assessment

5. POLICY CONTEXT

National Planning Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

This Framework is a material consideration in planning decisions. In assessing and determining development proposals, local planning authorities should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Section 4 Promoting sustainable transport

Section 6 Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes

Section 7 Requiring good design

Section 8 Promoting healthy communities

Section10 Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding & coastal change

Development Plan

Regional Spatial Strategy for the North-West of England (2008)

Policy DP1-9	Spatial Principles
Policy RDF1	Spatial Priorities
Policy L1	Health, Sport, Recreation, Cultural & Education Services Provision
Policy L4	Regional Housing Provision
Policy L5	Affordable Housing
Policy RT1	Integrated Transport Networks
Policy RT2	Managing Travel Demand
Policy RT4	Management of the Highway Network
Policy RT9	Walking & Cycling
Policy EM1	Environmental Assets
Policy EM2	Remediating Contaminated Land
Policy EM3	Green Infrastructure
Policy EM5	Integrated Water Management
Policy EM18	Decentralised Energy Supply

RBC Core Strategy DPD (November 2011)

AVP2	Strategy for Bacup, Stacksteads, Britannia & Weir
Policy 1	General Development Locations and Principles
Policy 2	Meeting Rossendale's Housing Requirement
Policy 3	Distribution of Additional Housing
Policy 4	Affordable & Supported Housing
Policy 8	Transport
Policy 9	Accessibility
Policy 17	Rossendale's Green Infrastructure
Policy 18	Biodiversity, Geodiversity & Landscape Conservation
Policy 19	Climate Change and Low & Zero Carbon Sources of Energy
Policy 22	Planning Contributions
Policy 23	Promoting High Quality Designed Spaces
Policy 24	Planning Application Requirements

Other Material Planning Considerations

RBC Open Space & Play Equipment Contributions SPD (2008)

6. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

RBC (STRATEGIC HOUSING)

The scheme supports the objectives and priorities within the Pennine Lancashire Housing Strategy by meeting :-

Objective 1: To ensure a sufficient quantity, quality, and appropriate type of housing supply, to meet the economic growth aspirations and social needs of Pennine Lancashire: &

Objective 2: To develop sustainable neighbourhoods that can retain and attract successful households reducing disparities between neighbourhoods and providing linkages to economic growth and employment opportunities; improving the economic performance of the sub-region.

Furthermore, this scheme will support the developments made by the Council through its housing market regeneration programme in Bacup and Stacksteads and on-going regenerative work within the town.

The previous application, which was for 90 residential units, provided only 6% affordable housing units, equating to 5 affordable homes. This new scheme looks to provide 30% affordable housing units equating to 25 units of accommodation. The affordable housing units will be managed and owned by Great Places Housing Association, a preferred Registered Provider of the Council and the Pennine Lancashire Housing Partnership. The funding for these units has already been identified by Great Places and forms part of their grant funding from the Homes and Community Agency's National Affordable Housing programme for 2011 – 2015.

The tenure of the affordable housing units will be based on an affordable rent model and is similar to the Fernlea Garage site scheme within Bacup, which has been recently completed and let. The lettings data from the Fernlea scheme and the Council's Choice Based Lettings allocation system indicate that there is significant need in the area and across the whole of Rossendale to support this type of tenure.

A lot of work has been undertaken over the last 18 months by the Applicant and their Registered Provider partner to develop a scheme that is more attractive; provide long-term sustainability; and is responsive to the form and layout of the area. The proposed scheme provides a substantial amount of much needed, affordable properties compared to the previously approved application and is with a recognised, preferred partner Registered Provider for Rossendale.

Accordingly, support this application.

RBC (ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH)

The Consultant employed by the Environmental Health Unit has advised as follows :

Planning permission has been previously granted for residential development (erection of 90 dwellings) at the site in (reference 2004/143), with extension of time limit granted in 2010 (ref 2010/0115). The planning permission had a contaminated land condition attached. In addition we provided technical guidance in 2008 regarding site investigation and risk assessment that has been carried out by RAW consulting and SLR Consulting Ltd.

The sub soil surveys phase 1 report recently provided for review identifies former uses of the site include a historical landfill of unknown waste type; the historical mapping shows unspecified heaps on the site from 1891. In addition mills, a saw mill, a timber yard, engineering works and an unspecified works were shown in the surrounding area. The conceptual site model demonstrates several possible source-pathway-receptor SPR linkages, further investigation is recommended to determine whether these linkages exist. We agree with the requirement for further investigation, and recommend that due to the unknown nature in the infill material, a comprehensive suite of analysis is carried out. The Phase 1 report does detail contaminants of concern, however we would recommend additional analysis such as VOCs/SVOCs and asbsestos. Contaminants of concern to be tested should be considered thoroughly.

The Phase 1 report provides an adequate preliminary risk assessment. Therefore it is recommended that should the application be approved, a suitable condition be included requiring further investigation and risk assessment. For example

1. A site investigation report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. The report shall address the nature, degree and distribution of land contamination on site and shall include an identification and assessment of the risk to receptors focusing primarily on risks to human health and the wider environment.
and

2. The details of any proposed remedial works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. Such remedial works shall be incorporated into the development during the course of construction and completed prior to occupation of the development. (If during any works on site contamination is suspected or found or contamination is caused the LPA shall be notified immediately. Where required, a suitable risk assessment shall be carried out and/or any remedial action shall be carried out to an agreed process and within agreed timescales in agreement with the LPA)
and
3. A verification report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. The VR shall validate that all remedial works undertaken on site were completed in accordance with those agreed with the LPA.

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY

No objection in principle to the proposed development, subject to the inclusion of conditions as referred to below :

Flood Risk

We have reviewed the Flood Risk Assessment submitted with the application and have no objection to the principle of the development providing surface-water discharge rates to the River Irwell are restricted. It notes that additional information has been submitted regarding the scheme of attenuation and, having had an opportunity to review this, it states “We have no flood risk related objections to this [scheme of attenuation] but the design must ensure that when the capacity of the ponds is exceeded, adjoining properties are not flooded from overland flow”. Accordingly, it is recommended that any permission now granted is conditioned as follows:

CONDITION 1 The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until such time as a scheme to regulate surface water run-off has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The scheme shall be completed in accordance with the approved plans.

REASON To reduce the risk of flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of/disposal of surface water from the site.

In amplification, it welcomes the potential use of above ground detention ponds, as part of a site wide SUDs design (Capita Symonds, 22 December 2011) but would wish any such residential development layout and consequent new surface water drainage scheme from this to integrate with existing topography and wetland, riparian features. With the site encompassing the River Irwell wildlife corridor, linking wetlands and species rich flora, there is significant nature conservation value associated with the site it wishes protected and, where possible, integrated and enhanced, as part of future flood risk and surface water attenuation proposals for the new residential development.

The submitted ecological assessment (Brooks Ecological Ltd, Jan 2008) indicating the site to be particularly steep and wet where adjoining the River Irwell, requires there to be a sustainable and environmentally sensitive form of surface water regulation both during the construction phase and as part of final scheme design, to prevent any water quality problems impacting on the river and its fishery, and preferably preserving and enhancing the existing identified wetland features on site. Such an integrated design may offer a considerable more sustainable solution, and more effective way to amalgamate the current site’s ecological, landscape and wildlife value, with the flood risk and site drainage issues.

Flood Defence Consent

As the River Irwell is a designated “Main River”, and is subject to Byelaw Control, no works may take place within 8m of the bank top without its prior consent. Its consent is also required under the Water Resources Act 1991, for the erection of any structures on, over or within the channel of the watercourse, including construction of surface water outfalls.

Biodiversity

There has been a desire from the outset of initial residential development proposals on this greenfield riparian site, that the River Irwell and identified linking marshy grassland/wetland seepage areas be protected and integrated as part of any future development proposals on this site. It is recommended as part of the overall habitat management plan that the steeply sloping and relatively wet riverside banks are largely undisturbed, to protect the river from increased levels of siltation during construction, but also protect the adjoining marshy grassland areas here. Based on wetness of retained Open Area 1, it will probably be inappropriate to create new heathland habitat here (as suggested by Capita Symonds, 16 Dec 2011).

Development that encroaches on rivers has a potentially severe impact on their ecological value. This is contrary to government policy in Planning Policy Statement 1 and Planning Policy Statement 9 and to the UK Biodiversity Action Plan. Land alongside River Irwell is particularly valuable for wildlife and it is essential this is protected. Article 10 of the Habitats Directive also stresses the importance of natural networks of linked corridors to allow movement of species between suitable habitats, and promote the expansion of biodiversity. Such networks may also help wildlife adapt to climate change.

The proposed development will only be acceptable if a planning condition is imposed requiring a scheme to be agreed to protect the buffer zone around the River Irwell. That scheme should include:

- plans showing the extent and layout of the buffer zone
- details of any proposed new planting in this riparian corridor, that protect the current corridor's ecological value.
- details demonstrating how the buffer zone will be protected during development and managed/maintained over the longer term
- details of any new permanent fencing, lighting etc. along the key wildlife corridor.

CONDITION 2 Prior to the commencement of development, a scheme for the provision of an undeveloped buffer zone, a minimum of 10m alongside the River Irwell shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.

REASON To ensure the protection and enhancement of the riparian corridor

The proposed development will only be acceptable if a planning condition is imposed requiring a scheme to be agreed to ensure that the landscape within the site is managed in such a way as to protect the ecological value of the site, including the River Irwell and adjoining 4 retained open areas. That scheme should include:

- an updated habitat survey, conducted at optimal spring/summer time period, to identify all areas of floristic interest
- detail of habitat conservation and retention plan of all notable species rich areas in LWS.
- detail of any translocation methods and locations, of identified areas of conservation value
- details of extent, location and type of new planting, including planting schedule which is largely based on native species.

- details of maintenance regimes
- details of any new habitat created on site
- details of treatment of steep riparian site boundaries and any linking above ground SUDs options.

CONDITION 3 Prior to the commencement of development a landscape management plan, including long- term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscaped areas (except privately owned domestic gardens), shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The landscape management plan shall be carried out as approved and any subsequent variations shall be agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

REASON To ensure the protection of wildlife and supporting habitat and secure opportunities for the enhancement of the nature conservation value of the site.

Japanese knotweed, Himalayan Balsam and Rhododendron are invasive plants, the spread of which is prohibited under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Without measures to prevent its spread as a result of the development there would be the risk of an offence being committed and avoidable harm to the environment occurring.

CONDITION 4 Prior to the commencement of development, a detailed method statement for the removal or long-term management /eradication of Japanese knotweed, Himalayan Balsam and Rhododendron on the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The method statement shall include proposed measures to prevent the spread of Japanese knotweed, Himalayan Balsam and Rhododendron during any operations such as land reprofiling, strimming or soil movement. It shall also contain measures to ensure that any soils brought to the site are free of the seeds / root / stem of any invasive plant covered under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Development shall proceed in accordance with the approved method statement.

REASON To ensure that the invasive weed species Japanese knotweed, Himalayan Balsam and Rhododendron present on site are prevented from spreading and/or eradicated.

Land Contamination

Having reviewed the submitted Sub Soil Surveys Ltd, Phase 1 (Desk Study) Report (December 2011) report with respect to potential risks to controlled waters from land contamination it recommends that any permission is conditioned as follows:

CONDITION 5 No development approved by this planning permission shall be commenced until:

- a) A site investigation has been designed for the site using the information obtained from Sub Soil Surveys Ltd, Phase 1 (Desk Study) Report (December 2011) for the site. This should be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to that investigation being carried out.
- b) The site investigation and associated risk assessment have been undertaken in accordance with details approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- c) A method statement and remediation strategy, based on the information obtained from b) above, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The development shall then proceed in strict accordance with the measures approved. Work shall be carried and completed in accordance with the approved method statement and remediation strategy referred to in (c) above, and to a timescale agreed in writing by the local planning authority, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

If during development contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted, and obtained written approval from the local planning authority for, an addendum to the Method Statement. This addendum to the Method Statement must detail how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with.

Upon completion of the remediation detailed in the Method Statement(s) a report shall be submitted to the local planning authority that provides verification that the required works regarding contamination have been carried out in accordance with the approved Method Statement(s). Post remediation sampling and monitoring results shall be included in the report to demonstrate that the required remediation has been fully met. Future monitoring proposals and reporting shall also be detailed in the report.

REASON To ensure that the proposed development (including the site investigation and remediation strategy) will not cause pollution of ground and surface waters both on and off site

In amplification, it advises that the Environment Agency's records indicate that the proposed development site is located on a historic landfill. It considers that this land use may have given rise to potential land contamination. The above conditions ensure that any potential risks posed to controlled waters from land contamination are appropriately assessed and mitigated.

The River Irwell is located directly north of the site and Trough Syke is located approximately 40 metres south west of the site and it considers these to be the main controlled waters receptors of concern.

It notes the recommendations of the submitted report to undertake site investigation works and suggests also that some controlled waters risk assessment is included within the works.

LCC (HIGHWAYS)

It objected to the originally submitted scheme for the following reasons :

Internal Access : The design of the estate road is such that the long straight sections of carriageway with parallel kerb lines gives opportunity for higher than expected vehicle speeds for a residential development. The estate road should be designed to accommodate vehicles with a maximum speed of 20mph which will be the speed limit. It should also be designed in line with Manual for Streets 2 to give a more inclusive design that benefits all highway users, with priority for pedestrians and cyclists.

Parking : The number of parking spaces on the development falls below the requirements of LCCs parking standards. Providing less than the required amount of off-street parking will result in vehicles being parked on the highway, to the detriment of highway users and the neighbouring properties of Anderson Close and Grafton Villas.

Following discussion with the Highway Authority, the Applicant has now submitted an amended Layout. It incorporates narrowings of the proposed carriageway at several points in order to

restrain traffic speeds and formation of a traffic-table midway along the intended loop-road to demark that drivers here do not have priority over pedestrians or users of the Public Footpath here. This accords with the principles of the scheme LCC Highways, but departs slightly from the details discussed. I would in any case require further details of the these works to ensure that they meet their functional need in a manner which does not unduly detract from the character and appearance of the proposed estate. LCC Highways is also now satisfied that adequate off-street parking is being proposed to address its initial concern that residents parking may take place on the highway.

Accordingly, it is now of the view that, if the application is to be approved, it would ask that :

A Section 38 Agreement is entered into by the applicant with Lancashire County Council to cover the adoption of the estate roads, including the retaining walls adjacent to the highway, which will need approval by its Structures Team.

A Section 106 agreement is first entered into to secure payment by the Developer of	£47,000
to improve the accessibility of the site by :-	
• provision of 3 x bus shelters (1 x Rochdale Road, 2 x New Line)	£6,000
• FP486 improvements and upgrade to cycleway	£20,000
• Creation of new footpath from FP486 to Lane End Road (to cross private land presently separated from wooded RBC land by a high fence)	£5,000
• Highway safety improvements	£16,000
○ Market Street / Rockcliffe Road junction improvement	
○ Greycliffe Lane / Rockcliffe Road one way system	
○ Greycliffe Lane new footway	
○ Parking restriction TRO's on Anderson Close & Rockcliffe Road.	

LCC (CONTRIBUTIONS)

Having regard to the LCC which has been approved by the County Council, and endorsed by this and other district councils, its Contributions Officer has requested that the following contributions be sought from the Applicant :

A. Transport

To enable its Travel Planning Team to provide a range of services as described in 2.1.5.16 of the 'Planning Obligations in Lancashire' policy paper dated September 2008 a contribution of **£6000** is required. This could provide :

- Leaflets and maps for travel information packs for residents
- Advice and guidance on travel plan development
- Support meetings
- Access to Lancashire's car sharing website
- Monitoring the development of the Plan

B. Youth and Community

Based on the methodology for the Young People's Service set out in the Planning Obligation Policy the contribution rate of £660 per dwellings of 2+ bedrooms results in a request for **£54,120**.

Bacup is a priority for the Young People's Service. Request a planning contribution that could be appropriately used to enhance the facilities at KG's Centre, 12 - 14 King Street, Bacup, to provide a warm, welcoming facility for the young people on this new development.

C. Education

Based upon the latest information - the 2011 annual pupil census and resulting projections

- it seeks a contribution for the full primary pupil yield of this development of 29 places, which results in a claim of : 29 Primary Places @ (£12,257 *0.9) x 1.055 = **£337,503**

In amplification, it states that latest projections for the local primary schools show there to be a shortfall of 217 places in 5 years' time, the shortfall will occur without the impact from this development. These projections take into account the current numbers of pupils in the schools, the expected take-up of pupils in future years based on the local births, the expected levels of inward and outward migration based upon what is already occurring in the schools and the housing development within the local 5 year Housing Land Supply document, which has already had planning permission.

With respect to the local secondary schools, the latest projections show there to be approximately 280 places available in 5 years' time. With an expected pupil yield of 21 pupils of secondary school age from this development, we would not be seeking a contribution from the developer in respect of secondary places.

D. Waste Management

The County Council makes vital major investments in waste management infrastructure for reasons of environmental protection and sustainability. Also, the necessity to secure the County Council's budget position as a waste disposal authority, through investing in an early switch away from land filling, has become all the more apparent, since the recent announcement on the rise in landfill tax in this year's National Budget . Every District in the County is being provided with advanced treatment facilities to treat waste prior to land filling, either directly or via purpose designed transfer stations. Since each and every new house, wherever it is in the County, has to be provided with this basic service and the Council has to comply with significant new requirements relating to the management of waste, it is considered that the Council it requests a contribution based upon the Policy Paper methodology for Waste Management of **£39,360**

NATURAL ENGLAND

This proposal does not appear to affect any statutorily protected sites or landscapes, or have significant impacts on the conservation of soils, nor is the proposal EIA development. It appears that Natural England has been consulted on this proposal to offer advice on the impact on a protected species. Any proposal thought to have implications for Protected Species should be considered in accordance with its Standing Advice.

7. REPRESENTATIONS

To accord with the General Development Procedure Order 8 site notices were posted on 23/1/12, a press notice was published on 20/1/12 and approximately 250 neighbours were notified by letter.

Four objections have been received, making the following points :

- This area does not need another housing development - there are two huge housing estates being developed nearby which are struggling to sell properties.
- Lack of infrastructure in Rossendale to adequately cope with the present number of residents let alone another 82 households, with maybe 100-150 extra vehicles, particularly in relation to local schools and transport infrastructure.
- Construction traffic would pose a safety risk for local residents.

- Local residents will be subjected to prolonged periods of noise on a daily basis during the construction period.
- Loss of one of the few remaining open spaces in the area with a public footpath crossing it and enables people to walk and exercise their dogs.

8. ASSESSMENT

In dealing with this application the main issues which need to be considered are :

- 1) Principle
- 2) Housing Policy
- 3) Contamination & Ground Stability
- 4) Design & Appearance
- 5) Neighbour Amenity
- 6) Access/Parking
- 7) Planning Contributions

Principle

I do not consider that there is objection in principle to development of this site having regard to its location within the Urban Boundary of Bacup, previous allocation for residential development in the Rossendale District Local Plan, and previous permissions for residential development with 80+houses (the last of which only recently became time-expired).

The Council's recently adopted Core Strategy proposes that a significant amount of the new 3,700 dwelling units it requires between 2011 and 2026 should be provided within Bacup and this site is reasonably sustainable in terms of its distance from the Town Centre and 'quality' bus routes.

In the following Section the 'benefit' of the scheme in terms of Affordable Housing is considered and in a later Section the 'harm' in relation to Greenlands.

Housing Policy

As has already been said, the proposed scheme would make a useful contribution towards meeting the need for additional housing land to be found in Bacup over the 2011-2026 period.

The market-housing being proposed is of an appropriate mix of house sizes and forms. The 25 affordable housing units being proposed is significantly in excess of what previously proposed &/or permitted schemes would have yielded.

The Affordable Housing policy of the recently-adopted Core Strategy indicates that for a site of this size a minimum of 30% of the units should be affordable if the site is 'greenfield' and 20% if it is 'brownfield', with a relaxation from this only if it can be demonstrated that this level of affordable housing would make the site unviable. Having regard to the building-out of bungalows and houses on only a small part of the site allocated in the Rossendale District Local Plan for development, and the way in which land bounding Grafton Villas/Anderson Close was since been left 'un-finished' when the permitted scheme for development of the rest of the allocated site ceased, I do not consider it would be altogether appropriate to look on the application site now as a 'greenfield site'. Furthermore, even in those years since allocation of the site for residential development in the Local Plan (adopted 1995) and in which the housing market has been more buoyant than it is now, the constraints/costs in undertaking its construction with minimal affordable housing provision have not been sufficiently attractive in financial terms to secure its development.

The Council's Housing Officer is supportive of the proposal, indicating that there is significant need in the area and across the whole of Rossendale for affordable units of the size/form/tenure being proposed.

Contamination & Ground Stability

The Council's Environmental Health Officer employed independent consultants to review the applicant's Ground Condition Assessment, and associated documents, in respect of risks to human health. Likewise, the Environment Agency has commented in relation to the risks to groundwater/watercourses posed by the proposed development.

Both are generally satisfied with the scope of the desk-top and intrusive investigations that have been undertaken to date to establish the nature and extent of contamination and ground stability problems. Both agree broadly with the conclusions drawn about the remediation/mitigation measures that will be required if the proposed development is to be implemented. However, both are of the view that certain matters still require clarification and limited further assessment in order that they may be satisfied the proposed development can be undertaken without posing a significant risk to public health and to controlled waters. A condition is recommended to address this issue.

Design & Appearance

Policy 23 of the Core Strategy seeks to ensure development is of the highest standard of design that respects and responds to local context, distinctiveness and character.

The Highway Authority has expressed no concern about the road layout now proposed within the site and, generally, I am satisfied with the distribution of dwellings about the site which it will produce. The applicant has submitted not simply drawings of the individual house-types but of street-scene views, making it possible to see how they will relate to each other. A condition is recommended in respect of the ground levels that will need to be adhered to in respect not only of the roads and houses, but also their gardens and the position/form of any retaining walls, if a harmonious arrangement is to be ensured.

The scale of the development, and the topography of the area, are such that it will be visible to the public in various views from well beyond the site boundary. Whilst housing nearby is for the most part of local natural stone and slate, or substitutes for them, this is not entirely so; the terraces of houses on Ribble Street are faced with Accrington red brick.

The Applicant is proposing a suitable mix of house types across the site, varying from 1-storey to 2-storey/3-storey split-level houses, with grey-tiled roofs and, for the most part, stone-clad front elevations, though with significant areas of render to other elevations. Each of the houses will be setback from the road serving it in order that it may have both a front and a rear garden. This is considered appropriate. However, conditions are recommended to ensure submission and approval of full details of facing materials and boundary treatments, and the form of landscaping to be undertaken in respect of the open spaces to be provided within the site and maintenance arrangements for them.

The additional work required to satisfy the Council's Environmental Health Unit and the Environment Agency in respect of ground remediation/stabilisation and surface-water discharge attenuation will need to be used to establish the finished ground levels and form of landscaping to be undertaken in the intended open spaces. There is a particular need to ensure engineering works do not result in these areas (some of which are designated as Greenlands) appearing unduly artificial/ 'hard-surfaced' and serve to diminish rather than enhance the wildlife value of the site. There is a need also to ensure that Public Footpath No 486 is provided with a suitable

surface/setting and desirable that the riverside open space is in a form that would make it possible for a footpath/cycleway to be provided at some future date linking the site to River Street.

Accordingly, in terms of design and appearance, the scheme is considered acceptable, although there is a need for conditions to address various matters of concern with regard to details.

Neighbour Amenity

I do not consider the development proposed on the site will detract to an unacceptable extent from the amenities existing neighbours could reasonably expect to enjoy.

Previously-permitted schemes for development of the site have relied entirely upon use of River Street/Bold Street/Grafton Villas for access by construction traffic and future residents. Having regard to the width/configuration of these roads. I can well appreciate the concerns then expressed by residents of properties fronting these roads about the additional noise and disturbance traffic generated by the development would cause them.

The current layout incorporates a loop-road that will enable vehicles to enter/exit the site either via River Street/Bold Street/Grafton Villas or directly from Rockcliffe Road. Thus the completed scheme now proposed is likely to result in less traffic noise and disturbance for residents of houses fronting River Street/Bold Street/Grafton Villas than previously considered acceptable.

The Applicant has indicated that the first phase of construction will include the 25 affordable housing units intended adjacent to the end of Grafton Villas/Anderson Close. It can be expected that most of the traffic associated with their occupation will wish to make use of River Street/Bold Street/Grafton Villas for access. However, the Applicant has indicated that even for these units they would wish construction traffic to make use of the new road to connect directly with Rockcliffe Road. To protect the amenities of neighbours it is considered appropriate to attach a condition in respect of the siting of the construction compound and means by which construction lorries access/exit the site.

Access/Parking

The Highway Authority has advised that the current proposal will not make matters materially worse in respect of congestion/danger on the highway than would implementation of previously-permitted scheme for up to 90 dwellings. Indeed, it considers it preferable that an estate of this size is not reliant on a single vehicular access. However, it has advised that there is a need for certain off-site highway works to be funded by the Applicant in the interests of highway safety. I consider it appropriate to limit the number of houses on the site that can be occupied prior to the new road connecting directly with Rockcliffe Road being available for use by residents and concur with its view upon the need for the Applicant to fund various off-site highway works.

LCC Highways originally expressed concern about the speed traffic might attain when descending from Rockcliffe Road down the new road. An amended scheme has now been received which incorporates traffic-calming measures it considers broadly acceptable. A condition is proposed to ensure that the scheme can be tweaked to address its remaining concerns regarding the finer detail of the scheme. It is satisfied that the scheme proposes adequate off-street parking to meet the needs of residents.

Planning Contributions

To accord with the Council's approved Play Space/Open Space SPD the Developer should pay £1,366 per dwelling, equating to a total sum of £112,012. As the proposed layout will result in loss of some Greenland to built-development, and the open spaces it proposes (though of some ornamental value) are not to have play equipment / significant play value, I consider it appropriate to require this contribution.

On Pages 12 & 13 of the Report are set out the financial contributions requested by the County Council, totalling £483983. As previously indicated, I consider the off-site highway works requested by the Highway Authority necessary in the interests of highway safety; its other requests (towards improvements to accessibility by pedestrians/cyclists and to increase the likelihood of bus use in preference to the car) and undoubtedly desirable. Likewise, I can appreciate the County Council's wish to secure funding towards the development of Youth & Community facilities give the number of dwellings proposed, but do not consider it to have made the site-specific case necessary to substantiate its request for a Waste Management contribution.

However, the greater part of the County Council request for monies relates to Education provision, £337,503 being sought to address a lack of capacity in local Primary Schools equivalent to the 29 children of primary school age the development is likely to possess. Members will re-call that proposal for residential development within the grounds of St Saviours Church and at Fernlea Service Station similarly drew requests for Education contributions due to a lack of capacity in the local Primary Schools. Application 2010/435 proposed the erection of 16 Affordable Housing units and was permitted by Committee without the £71,000 Education contribution being sought as St Vincent Housing Association indicated that they would not be able to proceed if required to pay it.

In this instance I do not have reason to doubt the view of LCC Education that the proposed development will add to a lack of capacity in local schools of in the order of 29 spaces. However, I am mindful that if this development does not proceed on its own assessment there will still be a lack of primary school capacity in the local area in 5 years of 188 places - broadly equivalent to the population of a new primary school.

The Applicant has reached an agreement with Great Places Housing Association that necessitates that work on construction of the 25 affordable units now proposed to be delivered in the period between the first week in May 2012 and 31 March 2013. The benefit of securing delivery of so many Affordable Housing units on this site given the constraints/costs in undertaking development of the site should not be under-estimated. In short, if the 'window of opportunity' presented by Great Places present interest in taking a significant proportion of the total number of dwellings at the start of the project is now lost I think it unlikely that in the short or medium term there is a reasonable prospect of getting this site built-out and no prospect of getting out of any scheme anything like the number of affordable units as now proposed.

Even in those years since allocation of the site for residential development in the Local Plan adopted in 1995 and in which the housing market has been more buoyant than it is now, the constraints/costs in undertaking its construction with minimal affordable housing provision have not been sufficiently attractive in financial terms to secure its development. Accordingly, for viability reasons I consider there no prospect of securing all the financial contributions now being sought even if significantly fewer than 25 of the proposed 82 houses were to be Affordable Housing - for the Developer the current agreement with Great Places has the virtue of providing sufficient pre-sales to enable the scheme to carry the costs/risks of remediating the site and funding the construction of the new road.

I am therefore drawn to the conclusion that, on the basis of the early delivery of 25 of the units as Affordable Housing, it is appropriate to recommend that Planning Permission be granted with an accompanying Legal Agreement to secure payment to the Council of £147,000. This sum would be adequate to cover the cost of the off-site highway works LCC Highways consider necessary and to provide play equipment/open space in-line with the Council's SPD, although it would be desirable for the Legal Agreement to be framed in such a way as to enable the monies to be expended (if the Council saw fit) on other things upon which financial contributions have been requested.

9. SUMMARY REASON FOR APPROVAL

The site is located within the Urban Boundary of Bacup and in a reasonably sustainable location in terms of its proximity to the Town Centre and bus services. The proposal will secure the redevelopment of prominent site with a significant amount of affordable housing. Subject to the accompanying Legal Agreement and the Conditions, the proposed development will not result in unacceptable loss of Greenlands, detriment to visual & neighbour amenity, risk of flooding & pollution, or loss of ecological interest and highway safety. It is therefore considered that the proposal accords with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), Policies RDF1 / L1 / L4 / L5 / RT1 / RT2 / RT4 / RT9 / EM1 / EM2 / EM3 / EM5 of the Regional Spatial Strategy for the North-West of England (2008) and Policies AVP2 / 1 / 2 / 3 / 4 / 8 / 9 / 17 / 18 / 19 / 22 / 23 / 24 of the RBC Core Strategy DPD (2011).

10. RECOMMENDATION

That Permission be granted, subject to:

- a) Completion of a Legal Agreement(s) to ensure that the 25 dwellings indicated are provided as Affordable Housing and payment to the Council of £147,000 for the purposes referred to above.
- b) The following Conditions.

CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
Reason: Required by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase 2004 Act.
- 2) Prior to commencement of development samples of the facing materials to be used in the elevations and roofs of the buildings, and for any retaining structures, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be carried out in accordance with those details approved, unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development, in accordance with Policy 24 of the RBC Core Strategy (2011).
- 3) Prior to the commencement of development :
 - a) A Contaminated Land Phase II report to assess the actual/potential contamination risks at the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
 - b) Should the Phase II investigations indicate that remediation is necessary then a Remediation Statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
 - c) The remediation scheme in the approved Remediation Statement shall then be carried out and a Site Completion Report detailing the action taken at each stage of the works (including validation works) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local planning Authority prior to first occupation of any part of the development hereby approved.
Reason : To ensure development of the site proceeds in a safe and satisfactory form, having regard to the findings of the submitted Contaminated Land Phase I report, in accordance with Policy EM2 of the Regional Spatial Strategy and Policy 24 of the RBC

Core Strategy (2011).

- 4) The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until such time as details of the proposed floor and external levels has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: In the interests of visual and neighbour amenity, highway safety and to reduce the risk of flooding, in accordance with Policy 24 of the RBC Core Strategy (2011).
- 5) No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a scheme for the provision and implementation of a surface-water regulation system has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Foul-water shall drain to a separate system. The scheme shall be completed in accordance with the approved plans.
Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding, in accordance with PPS25, in accordance with Policy 24 of the RBC Core Strategy (2011).
- 6) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 1995 (or any order amending or revoking and re-enacting that Order), garages forming part of the development hereby permitted shall be retained for the parking of a vehicle(s) and not converted to living accommodation without the submission and approval of an application for planning permission.
Reason: To ensure the retention of adequate off-street parking facilities, in the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policy 24 of the RBC Core Strategy (2011).
- 7) Prior to the occupation of any dwelling the drive/parking space(s) to serve it shall have been provided with a hard permeable surface and thereafter kept freely available for the parking of vehicles.
Reason: To ensure adequate off street parking, in the interests of amenity and highway safety, in accordance with Policy 24 of the RBC Core Strategy (2011).
- 8) The new estate roads, footpaths/cycleways within and bounding the site shall be improved/constructed to the standards and specifications to enable adoption by LCC (Highways) in accordance with a programme to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of the development. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed programme.
Reason: To ensure safe and satisfactory access arrangements, in accordance with Policy 24 of the RBC Core Strategy (2011).
- 9) Prior to first use of the development hereby permitted, a Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan shall be completed and carried out in accordance with the details approved, and will be updated and audited at intervals as approved and that approved shall be carried out.
Reason : To ensure a multi modal transport provision for the development and reduce traffic impact on the local road network in the interests of Highway Safety and sustainability, in accordance with Policy 24 of the RBC Core Strategy (2011).
- 10) Prior to the commencement of development a scheme for the provision and management of a buffer zone not less than 10m wide alongside the River Irwell shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Panning Authority. It shall include a detailed method statement for the removal or long-term management/eradication of Japanese knotweed. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance

with the approved scheme and management plan adhered to, and any subsequent variations shall be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect and enhance ecological, recreation and amenity interests by providing a buffer between the development and watercourses, in accordance with Policy 24 of the RBC Core Strategy (2011).

- 11) Notwithstanding the details submitted, prior to the commencement of development (including site clearance) a scheme of landscaping/boundary treatment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details shall include : the location of all existing trees and hedgerows on the site and shall specify those that are to be retained and the measures to be taken to protect them during construction of the development; replacement native tree planting or plant species of value to biodiversity to be undertaken; the areas to be hard-surfaced; the fences/walls/gates to be erected; and any changes of ground-level proposed.

Reason : In the interests of visual & neighbour amenity and to protect and enhance ecological interest, in accordance with Policy DC1 of the Rossendale District Local Plan.

- 12) All hard-landscaping/gates/walls/fences in the approved scheme of landscaping/boundary treatment shall be implemented prior to first occupation of the dwellings, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation. All planting in the approved scheme of landscaping/boundary treatment shall be implemented in the first planting season thereafter, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation. Any trees or plants which within a period of five years of planting die, are removed or become diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives consent to any variation.

Reason : In the interests of visual & neighbour amenity and to protect and enhance ecological interest, in accordance with Policy DC1 of the Rossendale District Local Plan.

- 13) Prior to any demolition works, ground contamination remediation works or construction works associated with the development hereby permitted a scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority providing details of :

- a) The siting of the Construction Compound;
- b) The routing to be used by lorries associated with the construction of the development hereby permitted and means by which the wheels of those vehicles will be cleaned before leaving the site.

The approved scheme shall be implemented.

Reason: To protect the amenities of neighbours and avoid the possibility of the public highway being affected by the deposit of mud and/or loose material, in accordance with Policy 24 of the RBC Core Strategy (2011).

- 14) Any demolition works, ground contamination remediation works or construction works associated with the development hereby approved shall not take place except between the hours of 7:00am and 7:00pm Monday to Friday and 8:00am and 1:00pm on Saturdays. No construction shall take place on Sundays, Good Friday, Christmas Day or Bank Holidays.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of neighbours, in accordance with Policy 24 of the RBC Core Strategy (2011).