HDM Planning Application Consultation Response

HDM Case officer: Matthew Payne / Sarah-Jane Imrie

Planning application number: 19/01362/REM

Description of development: Reserved matters application for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for proposed 150 residential dwellings (use class C3) including 30% affordable housing, pursuant to approved outline planning application 16/00078/OUT

Location: Land West Of Lancaster Park Pinewood Drive Lancaster Park Morpeth Northumberland

Date: 29th May 2020

RECOMMENDATION:

Amended plans and/or additional information required: Concerns could be overcome by submission and approval of amended plans or additional information before any permission is granted.

Assessment of proposal:

● The principle of the development has already been accepted through the granting of the original outline consent. This includes the transport related impacts outside the site.
● There is another Reserved Matters application in relation to Phase 1 of the overall development, which comprises the Trunk Road Service Area, Innovation Centre and Hotel, which is currently being determined by the Planning Authority. Highways related issues to that Reserved Matters application remain unresolved at this time.
● This Reserved Matters application relates to the residential element of the development, with no increase in quantum over the outline consent.
● A review of the revised internal layout of the development indicates concerns in relation to car parking and conformance to standards, bin storage location and drag route and pedestrian/cyclist network, lack of detail in respect to connections and vehicle swept path analysis.
● There are also significant concerns with the proposed removal of the pedestrian and cyclist link into Lancaster Park as this removes a key sustainable transport connection deemed necessary under the Outline permission.
● An amended site layout plan, revised house type plan and supporting information (added in red text below) have been provided as part of this reconsultation.

● This information has been reviewed, and an HDM response has been provided (added in blue text below).

● As such, there remain issues with the internal layout primarily linked to parking and lack of connectivity to Lancaster Park that require amendment before a recommendation can be made.

**Assessment of Proposal Checklist**

● **Transport Statement or Assessment**

No further comments to make from the response dated 10th June 2019.

● **Pedestrian routes, Public Transport and Cycles**

External access to sustainable transport was considered and deemed acceptable, through condition as necessary, as part of the outline application. In terms of sustainable transport access, key requirements were the provision of the bus stop at the access road and the pedestrian and cyclist connections to Lancaster Park to encourage the use of these modes over the private car.

In respect to this phase of the development, the proposed pedestrian/cyclist connection to Lancaster Park is the key connection that needs to be delivered, as well as the all modes connection via Phase 1 to the north.

● **The Phase 1 application has been recently resubmitted with revised proposals. However, these proposals do not match with the Phase 2 proposals and revised plans have been requested to tie the Phase 1 proposals in Phase 2 as shown on the revised submitted plans. However, there remains the potential for Phase 1 not to be delivered in advance of Phase 2 and as such, we would seek the Planning Authority's advice as to whether the full link to the A1 should form part of this Phase 2 Reserved Matters application. This is to ensure that access is possible through an potentially undeveloped Phase 1.**

The proposed connection shown to Lancaster Park, the 3m link is acceptable and whilst details in respect to this link are not shown in the submitted plans these details are secured under a pre-commencement condition (condition 8) under the outline permission. It is noted that the link is in a different location to that shown on the plans submitted at outline stage, but it is considered that the proposed location delivers the connection required for the residential development towards nearby services, including local schools, and onwards to the Town Centre.
The revised layout omits the previously indicated 3m into Lancaster Park, which is essential to allow connectivity between the two sites for access to the bus service, shops and local schools. Whilst this is secured by condition as previously mentioned, it would be beneficial for this to be included in the Reserved Matters plans to ensure deliverability and that the internal layout caters for the connection. The removal of the 3m link around the eastern boundary of the site as part of this layout and it’s re-provision adjacent to the internal carriageway, means that connectivity for cyclists is lost under the current proposals. As such this link, and route around the eastern boundary of the site, connecting to each cul-de-sac on that boundary, and the connection to Lancaster Park shall be reinstated and provided. It is noted in the applicant’s response to all consultees that the pedestrian and cyclist link into Lancaster Park is to be removed from the proposals. This has not been discussed with the Highway Authority and we have serious concerns and objections in relation to the removal of this key pedestrian and cyclist link into the site. This route was to be the prime pedestrian/cyclist connection to adjacent residential dwellings, local schools, facilities, local bus services and trips towards Morpeth Town Centre. The removal of this link has a significant impact upon the accessibility of the site and the sustainable transport connections to the site including the assessments made in the original Transport Assessment at the outline stage which was deemed acceptable on the basis that some sustainable transport trips could be accommodated via this route. It is the position of the Highway Authority that this connection be reinstated given it was deemed acceptable and necessary under the outline permission.

The connections through Phase 1, there is a discrepancy in relation to the design of the access road as it stood at the time of initial submission of the Phase 1 Reserved Matters application. The Phase 1 application included a 7.3m carriageway, two 3m verges and 3m shared cycleway/footways. The residential application shows a 5.5m access road, one 3m shared cycleway/footway on the east and a 2m footway to the west. Neither application currently shows the transition between these design standards and therefore these needs to be shown on the submitted plans. It also needs to be demonstrated that the alignment shown in Phase 1 connects to that within this residential development in an appropriate and seamless manner.

Due to the Reserved matters for the TRSA currently being delayed, we will send our road layout to the team bringing forward the reserved matters for this development. This will allow the TRSA to taper down the 7.3m carriageway down to 5.5m for the residential development area. Once this is done, detailed plans can be produced to show this transition. Following discussions with the parties and NCC, it was also agreed that the 3m cycle link will only be included on the eastern side of the access road, through the development.
○ The principle of these proposals should be effective and with the Phase 1 proposals being resubmitted and comments made in order to tie in these new Phase 2 proposals the transition will be occurring within the Phase 1 layout and in our comments to the Phase 1 application we will be ensuring this is the case.

Shared pedestrian/cyclist 3m wide connections from Phase 1 are also proposed to the west of the access road connecting to land behind Plot 42 and land opposite Plot 52 but these connections are not shown in the residential element of the proposals. These shall be included in the revised plans.

● This was an overlay error from the outline masterplan, through detailed design these routes have changed, with only one cycle link into the residential area from the TRSA along the eastern edge of the main spine road of the development.

○ The revised Phase 1 proposals also omit a link in this location and therefore it is acceptable for this link to also be omitted in the Phase 2 layout as currently submitted.

Further detail is requested in relation to the connections to the Country Park element of the development to ensure that these connections join with the Country Park proposals.

● The pedestrian and cycle connections from this residential development into the Country Park will be followed by the Country Park development, once their reserved matters is submitted. The engineer and landscape consultants are the same for both developments and therefore will tie in the proposals. This will be shown upon submission of the Country park Reserved Matters.

○ An indicative location remains a requirement to ensure that the internal layout of Phase 2 is capable of accommodating the Phase 3 (Country Park) Reserved Matters layout when that is submitted. If that application changes the location, then it will be for it to demonstrate the revised connectivity. However, the indicative proposals shown in the revised proposals are not acceptable as they show a full vehicular access to the County Park. There is no requirement for permanent vehicular access and that just the emergency access can be provided through the County Park. As such a full junction is not required and a simple dropped kerb arrangement would be acceptable and this would provide a better crossing of the adjacent turning head for pedestrians and cyclists accessing the County Park.

In relation to internal access for pedestrians and cyclists, this is generally acceptable and the two continuous 3m shared cyclist/pedestrian links along the main internal site road are welcomed and provide a continuous link from Lancaster Park, the
development, and Morpeth Northern By-Pass into the Country Park. However, no
details are provided in relation to the connection at the end of the 3m shared route
into the County Park and means by which pedestrians/cyclists will not be in conflict
when crossing the turning head around Plot 147. The diversion of the shared
pedestrian/cyclist route around the proposed Visitor Car Parking bay opposite Plot 4
is detrimental to the directness of this route and should be designed out.

- These connections to the Country Park are shown in the revised proposals,
  however the path around the eastern boundary of the site, including the link
  into Lancaster Park has been removed from the proposals as previously
  stated and should be reinstated to demonstrate compliance with the outline
  planning conditions in relation to the connections to Lancaster Park.

The proposed footway around the main access road between Plots 75 and 100 is
removed from the western side of the carriageway. This is acceptable as the
desire-line will be on the inside of the bend, however a connection should be
provided opposite Plot 110 to a section of footway on the western side to connect to
the currently proposed footway at Plot 100.

- This has been added, see attached layout.
  - This revision is acceptable with the provision of pedestrian dropped
    kerbs to access the footway being included in the detailed design
    subject to the S38 Technical Approval process.

A number of cul-de-sacs within the development are proposed to only have a
footway on a single side with a highway service strip in replace of a continuous
footway. However, some of these do not occur within the desire-line for pedestrians
around the shortest walking routes around bends.

- This has been addressed in the revised layout attached.
  - This has generally been adequately addressed although the footway
    alongside Plot 86 shall be continued around the VP bay and towards
    the turning head to provide pedestrian access to the private shared
    drive servicing Plots 86 & 87

Additionally, there are discrepancies between the architectural layout, the key within
the highways adoption plan and the landscaping plan in relation to these areas. In
relation to the latter, the plans show proposed hedges in the footway or service
strips, which would be unacceptable within the future highway. As such, clarity and
consistency is requested in relation to the submitted layout plans. The applicant is
advised that wherever a footway stops, a safe dropped kerb crossing will be required
and that footways shall not be discontinuous around visitor car parking bays.
As only an architectural plan has been resubmitted, this issue has resolved itself as the other previously submitted plans do not reflect the revised layout as shown in this drawing.

Road Safety

The impacts of the proposed development on the wider highway network in terms of road safety were assessed as part of the Outline application and therefore it is only road safety issues associated with the proposed internal layout that are relevant to this application.

The issues relating to the layout of the development as described in other sections of this response have the potential to result in road safety concerns if not adequately addressed. This position remains due to the issues raised in this revised response.

There are no firm details in relation to boundary treatment in respect to potential conflicts with visibility splays and tunneling effects. However, boundary details are secured by Condition 4 on the outline approval.

Travel Plan

No Travel Plan for the residential element of the wider scheme was secured under the outline approval. No further comments to make.

Car Parking

Car parking for the development is assessed against the design requirements and car parking standards as set out in Appendix D of the Northumberland Local Plan Publication Draft Plan (Regulation 19). An initial assessment of the car parking layout has been made, but it is clear that these design parameters and required level of car parking has not been met. As such, a site wide assessment has not been made at this time.

No additional information has been submitted in relation to garage sizes has been submitted and therefore our previous comments detailed below remain unchanged and the implications of the lack of car parking for the development remain valid. The information submitted by the applicant indicates that the layout has not been reassessed based upon the dimensional requirements set out in Appendix D of the Northumberland Local Plan and therefore to avoid abortive work, the layout has not
been assessed in detail at this time as no clear indication that changes have been made to the layout are outlined.

None of the proposed garages within the development, either stand alone or integral are sufficiently sized to count as car parking spaces for each dwelling. If these are not to be amended, then parking will need to be provided on drives and for the larger units in terms of bedrooms, this could lead to a detrimental street scale or design for the frontages.

The applicant shall review the proposed design of the car parking to ensure that the design parameters set out in Appendix D of the Northumberland Local Plan Publication Draft Plan (Regulation 19) have been met. This remains the case and shall be undertaken.

There are concerns over corner plots and the relation of the parking to those plots. There are cases, such as Plots 1 and 2, where parking on the highway would be more convenient than using the parking as intended or, in the case of Plots 16, 51 and 72, for example, visitor car parking bays are more convenient. Where rear or remote car parking is unavoidable, and measures have been taken to address the above concerns, paths direct from the parking area to the rear of the property on the demise of the said property, shall be provided. The revised proposals continue to have issues in relation to remote car parking on corner plots with VP bays provided in between the house entrance and the car parking area and also no internal walking routes through the dwelling’s rear garden where remote car parking is provided.

The overall number of visitor car parking spaces provided on site conforms to the parking requirement of 1 per 4 dwellings as set out in Appendix D of the Northumberland Local Plan Publication Draft Plan (Regulation 19). However, the spaces are not well spread out around the development and their distribution should be reconsidered. Particular areas of concern are in the vicinity of Plot 10, 38, 46 and 75. The revised proposals partially address this issue although there are still concerns in respect to the distribution of the spaces with a lack of nearby provision for the main east-west link between Plots 35 and 51. The proposed VP bays at the turning head to Plot 61 shall be pushed back such that vehicles are not parked in the service strip / footway area.

- **Cycle Parking**

Cycle parking for the development is secured under Condition 14 of the outline approval. The applicant is advised that garages are suitable for those plots with such a facility, even if it is currently not counted as a car parking space, but for those plots without garages, cycle parking shall be provided in a safe, secure and covered location with details submitted in accordance with the condition.
- **Highway Works**

External highways works to the site are secured under conditions with details of the access route to this application site remaining subject to the approval of the Phase 1 Reserved Matters application. As stated previously there are discrepancies in relation to the connection of the internal access road within this application to that proposed as part of the Phase 1 Reserved Matters application. These are to be resolved through the Phase 1 Reserved Matters application.

In respect to the internal highways layout, this is generally acceptable, however some amendments are required. In relation to the proposed deviation of the carriageway at Plots 42/43 and Plot 114, vehicle swept path analysis shall be submitted to demonstrate that a refuse vehicle and car can pass in these locations, in both directions.

- This has been addressed in this layout. If this is generally acceptable a swept path analysis can be undertaken to show this works. Vehicle swept path analysis is required to be submitted.

The proposed cul-de-sac to access Plots 8-28 has a near straight that is longer than the required 90m under a 20mph design speed for the internal road network. A more significant deviation than that shown in the vicinity of Plot 10 shall be provided.

- This has been addressed in the revised layout attached. This has been suitably addressed.

In relation to the Emergency Access Route from the B6343 to the south of the site, further detail is required in relation to where this is to connect to the proposed internal layout and how non-emergency vehicles will be prevented from driving through the Country Park.

- Details of this will be included in the Reserved Matters submission for the Country Park. Comments on this aspect have been made earlier in this response.

The applicant should note that under Condition 10 of the outline approval no part of the development, including those elements outside this Reserved Matters application, can be occupied until details of the Emergency Access Road are provided and the connection constructed in accordance with these details. This may necessitate an amendment to the build programme for the applicant.

The proposed private drive access points to the cul-de-sac ends at Plots 86, 89 and 90, as well as the access to the pumping station at Plot 86, are not directly onto the adoptable highway leading to potential maintenance issues going forward. These
shall be designed out to ensure that private drives connect parallel or perpendicular to the adopted kerb edge.

- This has been addressed in the revised layout attached. The revised proposals address this issue.

Vehicle swept path analysis of an 11.6m 3-axle refuse vehicle shall be submitted to demonstrate the proposed turning heads within the development are sufficient for this purpose.

- This will be undertaken upon general acceptance of the layout. This is agreed and vehicle swept path will be required once all other issues have been adequately addressed including car parking provision and the reinstatement of sustainable transport lines.

It is noted that an indicative S38 Adoption plan has been submitted, which is welcomed although as stated previously, there are issues with consistency with other plans submitted with the application. In respect to Plots 75 to 78, there is a gap between the adopted footway and adopted carriageway where vehicular access is located. The applicant should confirm whether this is indeed the intention, in respect to there being a vehicular dropped crossing route across potentially third party land or whether the full crossing shall be offered for adoption as highway.

- This will be revised when the layout is agreed, to avoid inconsistencies such as those mentioned. This noted.

Whilst we cannot force the application to offer elements of the development for adoption as public highway, there are potential benefits for the proposed pedestrian/cyclist link to Lancaster Park and the subsequent 3m route from Plot 1 to Plot 113 via Plot 17 to be offered for adoption as this provides an adopted link between the two residential areas. Other footway/cycleway connections towards Phase 1 and the Country Park could not be offered for adoption due to there not being a confirmed connection to the public highway at the other end.

- Highway Land and Property issues

The site relies upon the delivery of Phase 1 to gain vehicular access and for that the S38 process in relation to the access route to the A1 St Leonard’s Junction having been completed. The applicant is advised that if the Phase 1 S38 Process is not completed or is held up for whatever reason, the Highway Authority could not adopt the internal road layout for this site even if no issues were arising.

- Refuse Storage and Servicing

Details pertaining to the storage and servicing of the site for refuse collection are secured under Condition 19 of the development. However, the design of this scheme
should take into account the requirements for refuse storage and servicing. The proposed temporary bin stores located on the private drives have the potential to obstruct vehicular movement into and out of the private drives and no such facility is shown for the private drives to Plot 130 to 150. The bin store to Plot 69-71 shall be located adjacent to the highway. There are concerns in respect to the smaller dwellings, namely Plots 36-39, 47-50 and 54-57 that there is insufficient space to accommodate parking, pedestrian walking routes and a safe location for bins to be stored on the day of collection. This shall be considered as part of the review of these areas as part of the parking provision review detailed earlier in this response. The revised layout addresses the majority of the concerns raised in respect to temporary bin storage locations. However, the bin store for Plots 69-71 shall be relocated such that it is adjacent to the future highway rather than being located slightly away. Furthermore, for those terraced dwellings consideration to the bin presentation location shall be made such that any bins presented on the day of collection do not obstruct pedestrian routes to and from the dwellings and/or the parking spaces. It may be that temporary bin storage locations are provided for these terraced dwellings. As detailed above, vehicle swept path analysis of the 11.6m 3-axle refuse vehicle is required.

- Lighting

Street lighting proposals have been submitted, but these appear not to have been approved by Northumberland County Council street lighting. Nevertheless, these details are already secured under Condition 13 of the outline approval and as such do not need to be amended as part of this current application.

Planning Obligations and Conditions:

Necessary planning obligations and conditions required for planning approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S106 Heads of Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No new items over that secured under the Outline Permission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S278/S38/S59/S184 Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S38 and S278 as set out in the Outline Permission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reserve the right to recommend further conditions over that secured under the outline permission upon receipt and acceptance of the revised proposals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Reserve the right to recommend further informatives over that secured under the outline permission upon receipt and acceptance of the revised proposals.

**Consultation Checklist**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Lighting</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways Programmes, Traffic Management, Cycling</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Area Inspector, Waste, Greenspaces, Traffic Signals</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetworks</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure &amp; Adoption Records</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Design, Highway Structures &amp; Road Safety</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Plans and Public Transport</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Travel Plans</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Transport/ Passenger Transport Services</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S278</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S38</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>