

<b>Application Number:</b>	2015/0108	<b>Application Type:</b>	Other
<b>Proposal:</b>	Detached dwelling	<b>Location:</b>	16 Dalesford, Haslingden, BB4 6QH
<b>Report of:</b>	Planning Unit Manager	<b>Status:</b>	For publication
<b>Report to:</b>	Development Control Committee	<b>Date:</b>	19.1.2016
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr N. Sheikh	<b>Determination Expiry Date:</b>	25.1.2016
<b>Agent:</b>	Mr S. Hartley		

<b>Contact Officer:</b>	Tom Parkinson (Urban Vision)	<b>Telephone:</b>	0161 604 7782
<b>Email:</b>	tom.parkinson@urbanvision.org.uk		

<b>REASON FOR REPORTING</b>	
<b>Outside Officer Scheme of Delegation</b>	
<b>Member Call-In</b> Name of Member: Reason for Call-In:	
<b>3 or more objections received</b>	6 objections received & recommending approval.
<b>Other (please state):</b>	

## 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

That the Committee approve planning permission for the reasons set out in Section 9.

## 2. SITE

The application site comprises of a detached split-level property on an irregularly shaped plot situated on Dalesford, a residential cul-de-sac comprising of dwellings of varying designs and ridge heights. The applicant's property is constructed from natural stone with rendered elements and a pitched tile roof. The site is on sloping ground with the ground level falling away by approximately 6m moving north-east to south-west from the front to rear boundaries; however there is also a steep fall in the ground level at the north-west portion of the site towards the rear/side corner of the back garden resulting in the ground level falling by approximately 13m moving south-east to north-west across the site, with most of this fall adjacent to this part of the boundary. Due to these changes in

ground level the applicant's property appears to be single storey when viewed from the road and 2 storey when viewed from the rear. The plot includes an area of hard standing to the front, together with front, side and rear gardens, and patio areas immediately to the rear (west) and side (north) of the dwelling house.

Back garden boundaries are marked by mature trees and planting, including large conifers, except for a 6m wide gap midway along the northern boundary, where there is a view through to the neighbouring garden (No. 10 Dalesford), together with a 1.8m high wood panel fence along part of the north-west boundary and a further 1.8m high wood panel fence on top of a 2m high rockery along part of the south-east boundary. The latter boundary is adjacent to a line of mature evergreen and deciduous trees within the neighbouring curtilage which provides additional screening.

The site is bound by residential properties on all sides apart from a wooded valley/watercourse to the west, north-west and north, the latter separating and partly screening the application site from residential properties to west and north, with the rear boundaries of residential properties along Whitecroft Close (to the north) being a minimum of 13m from the application site, whilst the rear boundary of properties along Laund Hey View (to the west) are a minimum 11.3m away.

### **3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

**2013/0593:** Construction of detached dwelling. Approved by Members at DC Committee 25 March 2014.

**2011/0111:** Construction of detached dwelling. Recommended for Approval by Officer, subsequently refused by Members at DC Committee 12 July 2011. Reason for refusal: *"By reason of its siting/size/design the proposed dwelling, and its access, will detract to an unacceptable extent from the amenities neighbours could reasonably expect to enjoy. Furthermore, the proposed access is of a form/gradient likely to result in on-street parking to the detriment of highway safety and inconvenience of other road users. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to PPS1/PPS3/PPG13, Policies RT2/RT4/EM1 of the Regional Spatial Strategy and Policy DC1 of the Rossendale District Local Plan."*

### **4. PROPOSAL**

The applicant proposes to erect a part 2 storey/part 3 storey detached 5 bed house within the north-west portion of the back garden adjacent to the rear (west) and side (north-west) boundaries. The dwelling house will be built on the steepest part of the applicant's plot (as noted above) adjacent to the north-west boundary. The property's principal elevation would face south-east towards the garden's opposite side boundary. Due to the difference in levels across the site the building would appear as a 2 storey property from the front and a 3 storey property from the rear. The building would have dual pitched roofs with 2 gable elements (one markedly longer than the other) projecting to the front, a double garage to the side (north-east) and a raised rear balcony with access from the ground floor to the rear. Flights of steps (adjacent to each gable) would lead down to the plot's rear (north-west) boundary. The dwelling house would be a maximum of 8.6m long and 22.6m wide, and it would cover a ground area totalling 197 square metres. Its rear wall would be 3m-4.5m from the plot's north-west boundary, its south-west gable elevation would be 4m from the south-west boundary and its north-east (garage) gable elevation would be 7m from the north-east boundary facing the gable end of No. 10 Dalesford. The rear balcony would be 1.7m-2.6m from the north-west boundary. The property's principal elevation would have a ridge height of 7.85m and a maximum eaves height of 4.8m, whilst its rear (north-west/3 storey) elevation would have a ridge height of 10.5m and a maximum eaves height of 7.7m.

The building would accommodate an en-suite bedroom, utility room, sauna/bathroom, plant room and games room at basement level; a lounge, entrance, garage, den, garden room, and open plan kitchen/diner/sitting room at ground floor level; with 4 en-suite bedrooms at first floor level. The development would introduce at basement level rear (north-west) facing bedroom, games room, utility room, stairway and en-suite bathroom windows. At ground floor level it would introduce front (south-east) facing entrance, lounge, garden room and sitting/kitchen/dining room windows,

together with front facing glazed front and garden room doors, and a garage door. It would introduce rear facing sitting/kitchen/dining room, stairway, den and garage windows and balcony doors, together with side (south-west) facing sitting/kitchen/dining room and lounge windows, and side (north-east) facing lounge and WC windows. At first floor the dwelling would introduce front facing bedroom windows, rear facing bedroom, en-suite bathroom, wardrobe and stairway windows, and a side (south-west) facing bedroom window. The front facing roof slope would have 3 roof lights. The building would have facing brickwork and concrete roof tiles, final materials to be agreed by the LPA.

The proposed dwelling would be accessed via a porous tarmaced drive passing through the side-garden to the north of the applicant's current property. This would require the removal of several non-TPO trees adjacent to the road frontage, although the boundary hedge would remain. Due to the steeply sloping nature of the land to the north of the applicant's current property, the new drive would be constructed with retaining walls on either side with back filling to ensure a level access. The driveway would lead to an area of hard standing/turning head in front of the new property and providing access to the attached side garage.

Since the initial submission amended plans have been received. As a result, the proposed balcony no longer runs past the rear of the side garage.

The proposal differs from the 2 previous development proposals for a detached dwelling house to the rear of this plot.

The first scheme (reference 2011/0111, recommended for approval but refused by the DC Committee) was positioned more centrally within the applicant's back garden, being further from the north-west boundary (7.2m as opposed to 3-4.5m for the current proposal) and further from the south-west boundary (4.5m as opposed to 4m for the current proposal). This previous scheme was to be 18.2m long and 20.6m wide and aside from its different position it was orientated so its principal (2 storey) elevation faced north-east along the side of the applicant's current property towards Dalesford, with its side (3 storey) elevation, which also included a balcony, positioned along the steep bank facing the north-west boundary. The property's principal elevation had a ridge height of 8.2m and an eaves height of 5.3m, whilst its side (north-west/balcony) elevation had a ridge height of 11.7m and an eaves height of 8.3m. This scheme would have covered a ground area totalling 239 square metres. External materials were to be agreed with the LPA.

The second scheme (reference 2013/0593 – recommended for approval and approved by the DC Committee) was for a notably smaller dwelling compared to the original and current proposals. Like the current proposal it would have been orientated so its principal elevation faced towards the south-east (side) boundary. It would have had 2 floors on all sides with a large area of decking along its rear (north-west) elevation. Its main rear wall would have been 10.6m from the north-west boundary whilst its side (south-west) elevation would have been 3m from the south-west boundary. It would have covered a ground area totalling 143 square metres. At its principal elevation it would have had a ridge height of 6.1m and an eaves height of 3.6m, whilst at its rear elevation, due to the sloping ground, it would have had a maximum ridge height of 8.8m and a maximum eaves height of 6.6m. External materials would have been coarse stone clad walls, artificial slate roofs and UPVC doors/window frames.

**Table Comparing the Current Proposal with Previous Schemes**

Scheme reference	2011/0111 (Refused)	2013/0593 (Approved)	2015/0108 (Current)
Ground area	239 square metres	143 square metres	197 square metres
Maximum Ridge Height	11.7m	8.8m	10.5m
Maximum Eaves Height	8.3m	6.6m	7.7m

## 5. POLICY CONTEXT

### National

#### **National Planning Policy Framework**

Section 1	Building a Strong Competitive Economy;
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;
Section 10	Meeting the Challenges of Climate Change, Flooding, etc;
Section 11	Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment;
Section 12	Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment.

#### **National Planning Practice Guidance**

### Development Plan Policies

#### **Rossendale Core Strategy DPD (2011)**

AVP 6	Strategy for Haslingden and Rising Bridge;
Policy 1	General Development Locations and Principles;
Policy 2	Meeting Rossendale's Housing Requirement;
Policy 18	Biodiversity and Landscape Conservation;
Policy 23	Promoting High Quality Design & Spaces;
Policy 24	Planning Application Requirements.

## 6. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

**Highways:** No objection. Informative requested.

**United Utilities:** In accordance with the NPPF and Building Regulations, the site should be drained on a separate system with foul water draining to the public sewer and surface water draining in the most sustainable way. A public sewer crosses the site and UU will not permit building over this. A 6m wide access strip must be retained. To reduce the volume of surface water draining from the site permeable paving on all driveways and other hard standing areas including footpaths and parking areas should be used. No objection subject to drainage condition. Informatives requested.

## 7. NOTIFICATION RESPONSES

To accord with the General Development Procedure Order a site notice has been displayed and 14 neighbour letters posted.

6 letters of objection have been received which raise the following issues;

- *The proposed building would be larger than the previously approved (second) scheme and would result in an overdevelopment of the plot.*

These issues are considered further in the assessment section below.

- *The proposed building would be virtually the same size as the first scheme which was refused by the Development Control Committee.*

It is accepted that the proposed development would be similar in scale to the first scheme.

- *The Design and Access Statement submitted with the current application is incorrect in that it states that the first (refused) proposal had a floor area of 235 square metres, whereas the Design and Access Statement actually submitted with the first refused proposal stated that this was to have a floor area of 194 square metres. The current proposal has a claimed floor area of 188.25 square metres which is only 6 square metres less than the floor area of the originally refused scheme.*

It is accepted that the submitted Design and Access Statement is incorrect in some respects.

- *The applicant has not provided evidence of the existing and proposed levels especially relative to adjacent properties.*

This application has been assessed following a site visit and with reference to a proposed site plan and levels plans which indicate the differences in ground level across the site.

- *The development would result in an unacceptable amenity/privacy impact on adjacent properties.*

These issues will be considered further in the assessment section below.

- *The application site is constrained in size with steep slopes and cannot reasonably accommodate the proposed building. The site is unstable and the development could exacerbate this problem.*

These issues are considered further in the assessment section below.

- *The development could result in unacceptable drainage/flooding impacts. The development could damage the local sewer network.*

The LPA has consulted United Utilities who have not objected to the proposed development. It is noted that the proposed driveway would be constructed from porous materials.

- *The development would encroach upon or alter boundaries with neighbouring properties.*

The applicant has completed Certificate A on their application form indicating the development would only impact their own land. The LPA has no reason or evidence to dispute this further.

- *The development would result in unacceptable access/parking issues.*

The LPA has consulted Lancashire County Council's Highways who have confirmed no objection to the proposed development in terms of its access and parking impacts.

- *Due to the difference in levels within the site and between the site and neighbouring plots the proposed drive, turning circle and garage access would result in unacceptable car light impacts on neighbouring habitable room windows.*

These issues are considered further in the assessment section below.

- *The development could damage neighbouring trees.*

The proposals do not show their being an impact on neighbouring trees.

- *The development would result in unacceptable levels of construction traffic.*

The applicant's contractors are expected to minimise disruption to neighbouring properties.

## 8. **ASSESSMENT**

The main considerations of the application are:

The main considerations of the application are: 1) Principle; 2) Residential Amenity / Visual Amenity; 3) Neighbour Amenity; 4) Access/Parking, 5) Drainage; and 6) Land Stability.

### **Principle**

The site is located within Haslingden's Urban Boundary. Accordingly there is no objection in principle to residential development in this location.

The proposed dwelling would take up part of the applicant's back garden. When considering the principle of this development regard should be had to the balance between allowing for residential development in suitable locations which is encouraged, and safeguarding the character of established residential areas from over-intensive and inappropriate new development as referenced in Policy 2 of the adopted Core Strategy. It is considered that the proposal would not unduly harm the established character of the area (see below) and is not inappropriate development within this residential context. The proposal would therefore be acceptable in principle with reference to the provisions of the NPPF, together with Rossendale Core Strategy Policies 1, 2 and 24.

### **Residential Amenity / Visual amenity**

It is accepted that the proposed building would be substantial in size and would occupy a large proportion of the plot's current back garden, covering a ground area of 197. square metres. However, it is considered on balance that there remains sufficient amenity space left for the existing occupiers of 16 Dalesford and the future occupiers of the proposed development for the proposal to not be unacceptably detrimental in respect of residential amenity for either plot. In respect of visual amenity it is considered to be acceptable with reference to its position on ground which is lower than the current dwelling house and screened by dense banks of mature trees on and off site (including numerous coniferous trees) along its north, west and south boundaries, all of which would result in the property not being readily visible from Dalesford to the east or from adjacent properties to the north, west and south. It is not considered that the proposal would result on balance in an overdevelopment of the plot.

Whilst it is accepted that the proposed design differs from the applicant's property and other dwelling houses along Dalesford, it is also noted that surrounding properties have different designs, for example Nos. 10 and 14 Dalesford (immediately to the north of the site) differ from the applicant's current property having a more modern design, red brick fascias and different roof designs. As such it is considered that the design of the proposed dwelling house would be acceptable within this context. It is noted that the proposed dwelling would make use of the fall in the land to provide a 3 storey side elevation, with similar design solutions being found at several neighbouring properties.

The new driveway would result in the loss of several non-TPO trees adjacent to Dalesford and therefore visible within the street scene, however this would be acceptable as it is considered their contribution cannot be considered as significant in visual amenity terms. Nevertheless, it is considered having regard to biodiversity guidance in the NPPF biodiversity that additional planting of appropriate native species should be included in any future landscaping scheme.

The scheme is considered to be acceptable in terms of visual amenity and therefore would comply with Rossendale Core Strategy Policies 23 and 24 in terms of its design impacts.

### **Neighbour Amenity**

The development would be acceptable in terms of its amenity/privacy/overbearing impacts on neighbouring properties due to the above noted differences in ground level within the application

site and between the site and surrounding plots, together with the presence of dense banks of partly evergreen screening vegetation along the side and rear boundaries and the fact that the plot is separated from neighbouring sites to the west, north-west and north by a wooded valley. There will be a minimum 12.6m gap between the proposed front facing habitable room windows and the plot's southern boundary, this boundary marked by a 1.8m high wood panel fence on top of a 2m high rockery, which is also screened by a dense bank of vegetation within the neighbouring curtilage. The proposed rear facing habitable room windows would be 17.2m-19m from the rear boundaries of properties to the north-west (Nos. 2 & 4 Whitecroft Close), with these properties being separated by an intervening wooded valley, and with further dense banks of screening vegetation along their rear boundaries. The proposed balcony would be 15.2m-17m from these neighbouring boundaries. The development would introduce rear facing habitable room windows/outlooks which would directly face similar type openings in the rear elevation of the adjacent properties along Whitecroft close; however the minimum separation distance would exceed 40m, which would be acceptable.

The proposed dwelling house's side walls would be faced by ground floor habitable room windows in the rear elevation of the adjacent property to the north-east (No. 10 Dalesford), these neighbouring windows directly facing the 2 storey side elevation of the proposed longer front gable element. This would be acceptable because the directly faced side elevation would be on land approximately 3m lower than the neighbouring property's rear facing ground floor windows, with the separation distance being 27.7m. By way of comparison it is noted that the first scheme (reference 2011/0111) would have introduced a 2 storey elevation (in this case the new property's principal elevation) which would have been directly faced by these neighbouring windows, the separation distance being 28.5m.

It is noted that there is a gap in the boundary treatment along the north boundary and planning permission would be subject to a landscaping condition to ensure this is infilled with planting.

It is not accepted that the proposed access and turning arrangements would lead to an unacceptable car headlight amenity impact on neighbouring properties, with any impact being intermittent.

The development would have an acceptable amenity impact with reference to Core Strategy Policies 23 and 24.

### **Access/Parking**

There has been no objection from the Highway Authority with adequate access, parking and turning provided.

### **Drainage**

The Drainage Consultee has not objected to the proposal subject to a condition and informatives. Subject to these it is not considered that the proposed development would result in an unacceptable flooding/drainage impact on the local area.

### **Land Stability**

Concerns have been raised by neighbouring occupants regarding the proposal's potential land stability impacts. Having regard to the site and the extensive works that would be required during construction, planning permission should be subject to a condition ensuring any potential risks and identified and addressed prior to the commencement of development having regard to government guidance in the latest national planning practice guidance.

## Differences from Previously Refused Scheme

It is noted that a similarly scaled property was previously proposed at this location (planning application reference 2011/0111), with the assessing officer recommending this scheme for approval, however it was refused by the DC Committee due to the following:

*'By reason of its siting/size/design the proposed dwelling, and its access, will detract to an unacceptable extent from the amenities neighbours could reasonably expect to enjoy. Furthermore, the proposed access is of a form/gradient likely to result in on-street parking to the detriment of highway safety and inconvenience of other road users. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to PPS1/PPS3/PPG13, Policies RT2/RT4/EM1 of the Regional Spatial Strategy and Policy DC1 of the Rossendale District Local Plan.'*

Firstly with reference to the current proposal's access/parking impacts it is considered that the current proposal can be distinguished from the 2011 scheme in that the current proposal essentially incorporates the access and parking layout of the interim scheme (reference 2013/0593) which was approved by the DC Committee. It is also noted that the Highways consultee has raised no objections to the current scheme's access/parking arrangements.

Secondly, whilst it is accepted that the current proposal is broadly similar in terms of its scale and siting to 2011 scheme previously refused by the DC Committee, it is noted that the previous scheme was assessed under a different policy context which was prior to the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) and also prior to the formal adoption of Rossendale's Core Strategy (November 2011). It is noted that the NPPF includes a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which it is considered this development is subject to the use of planning conditions. It further accords with both policies of the development plan and other parts of the NPPF for the reasons set out in this report and therefore should be approved. As such it is considered that the current scheme can be distinguished from the previous proposed development refused by the DC Committee in July 2011.

## 9. SUMMARY REASON FOR APPROVAL

The proposed development would result in the erection of an additional dwelling house within the Urban Boundary which is acceptable in principle and subject to conditions, would not result in unacceptable visual/neighbour amenity, access/parking, drainage or land stability impacts. It is therefore concluded that the proposed development accords with Policies AVP 6, 1, 2, 18, 23 and 24 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy DPD, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

## 10. RECOMMENDATION

That the application be approved subject to conditions.

### CONDITIONS

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

*Reason: To ensure that the Local Planning Authority retains the right to review unimplemented permissions and to comply with Section 91 (as amended) of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.*

2. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following unless otherwise required by the conditions below:

'Proposed Site Plan and Sections', drawing number nazir 28-12-15-B, received 4 January 2016;

'Housetype', drawing number nazir 26-12-15-C, received 5 January 2016; and

'Site Plan 04/01/2015', received 4 January 2016.

*Reason: To ensure the development complies with the approved plans and avoids undue harm to visual or neighbour amenity, in accordance with Policy 24 of the Adopted Core Strategy (2011).*

3. Prior to the commencement of development samples of all external materials to be used, including the proposed balcony elements and the retaining walls hereby permitted, shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for their approval in writing. The development shall be constructed in accordance with materials approved and shall not be varied.

*Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to comply with Policies 1 and 24 of the Adopted Core Strategy (2011).*

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

*Reason: To safeguard the amenities of nearby residential properties, in accordance with Policies 1 and 24 of the Adopted Core Strategy (2011).*

5. Prior to the commencement of development a hard and soft landscaping scheme, including details of all boundary treatments, replacement planting to compensate for the loss of trees on site, and means of enclosure, full cross sections of the proposed access, parking and turning areas, and measures to protect existing trees and hedges on site, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme for the protection of trees/hedges during construction shall be adhered to. The fencing/walls/hard standings shall be implemented prior to first occupation of the development; and the approved planting scheme shall be implemented in the first planting season following commencement of the development. Any trees or shrubs removed, dying or becoming severely damaged or diseased within 5 years of planting shall be replaced by trees or shrubs of a similar size or species to those originally required to be planted unless the Local Planning Authority has otherwise agreed in writing.

*Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and biodiversity in accordance with Policies 1, 18 and 24 of the Adopted Core Strategy (2011) and the NPPF*

6. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order amending or revoking and re-enacting that Order) no extensions, alterations or outbuildings shall be carried out within the terms of Classes A, B and E of Part 1 of Schedule 2 without the prior consent of the Local Planning Authority.

*Reason: In the interests of residential amenity and in accordance with Policies 1 and 24 of the Adopted Core Strategy (2011).*

7. 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. The scheme shall be completed in accordance with the approved plans and shall not be varied unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

*Reason: To reduce the increased risk of flooding, in accordance with Policies 1 and 24 of the Adopted Core Strategy (2011).*

8. No development shall take place until an investigation of the site has been undertaken to ascertain whether the site is affected by slope instability. The investigation shall be undertaken in accordance with a brief which shall first be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.. The results of the investigation shall be provided to and approved in writing

by the Local Planning Authority and shall include a scheme for any necessary remedial measures and drainage provision. No development shall take place until the Local Planning Authority has approved a scheme for remedial measures. The approved remedial measures shall be implemented in full and written evidence to confirm the completion of the work provided to the Local Planning Authority before the dwelling is occupied.

*Reason: To ensure the area is fully stabilized and to ensure the successful development of the site, in accordance with Policies 1 and 24 of the Adopted Core Strategy (2011).*

9. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, a scheme for the disposal of foul and surface waters within the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.

*Reason: To ensure satisfactory drainage of the site and to avoid flooding in accordance with Policy 24 of the Adopted Core Strategy (2011).*

10. The vehicular hard standing shown on the approved drawing, titled 'Proposed Site Plan and Sections', nazir 28-12-15-B, received 4 January, shall be constructed and surfaced with a bound porous material and remain ungated.

*Reason: In the interests of highways safety and to comply with Policy 23 of the Adopted Core Strategy (2011).*

## **INFORMATIVE NOTES**

1. Standard approval informative – amended to be compatible with the NPPF;
2. Coal standing advice informative;
3. United Utilities informative:

The applicant can discuss further details of the site drainage proposals with Neil O'Brien at [wastwaterdeveperservices@uuplc.co.uk](mailto:wastwaterdeveperservices@uuplc.co.uk). Any further information regarding developer services or planning visit our website at [http://www.united\\_utilities.com/builders-developers.aspx](http://www.united_utilities.com/builders-developers.aspx). A separate metered supply to each unit will be required at the applicant's expense and all internal pipe work must comply with current water supply (water fittings) regulations 1999. Should this planning application be approved the applicant should contact our Service Enquiries on 0845 746 2200 regarding connection to the water mains or public sewers. A public sewer crosses this site and we will not permit building over it. We will require an access strip width of 6 metres, 3 metres either side of the centre line of the sewer. It is the applicant's responsibility to demonstrate the exact relationship between any United Utilities assets and the proposed development. United Utilities offer a fully supported mapping service and we recommend the applicant contact our Property Searches Team on 0870 751 0101 to obtain maps of the site. Due to the public sewers transfer, not all sewers are currently shown on the statutory sewer records. If a sewer is discovered during construction please contact a Building Control body to discuss the matter further.

4. Highways informative: The consent requires the construction, improvement or alteration of an access to the public highway. Under the Highways Act 1980 Section 184 the County Council as Highways Authority must specify the works to be carried out. Only the Highways Authority or a contractor approved by the Highways Authority can carry out these works and therefore before any access works can start you must contact the Environment Directorate for further information. Further details about creating a dropped crossing can be obtained from the Lancashire County Council website.