

**PRESTON CITY COUNCIL  
PLANNING COMMITTEE meeting 10 January 2019  
LATE CHANGES LIST**

Listed below are changes to the list of planning applications made as a result of additional information received since the publication of the agenda.

---

**Agenda Item 5b: 06/2018/0859  
A Touch of Spice – 521 Garstang Road  
Pages 59-77**

**Changes:**

**Section 3.3 Relevant Planning History**

Page 61, final line amend 'Refused May 2014' to read 'Refused May 2004'.

**Section 3.5 Consultation Responses**

Waste Management – No objection.

Ancient Monuments Society – No comments, refer to conservation officer comments.

Lead Local Flood Authority – No objection to the amended plans.

Publicity – One additional objection has been received which can be summarised as follows:

- A three storey development would be too large and will destroy privacy to the occupiers of the neighbouring property;
- Impact upon visual amenity;
- Loss of the existing car park has led to vehicles parking in Kingsway Avenue causing access and exit issues.

The matters raised above have been considered within the agenda report. Other matters raised within the objection are not material planning considerations and cannot be taken into account.

One representation of support for the application, which only supports the application if at least a third of the apartments were to be affordable rent for people over 55.

The proposal is for retirement apartments under Class C2 as such affordable housing provision is not applicable.

**Section 3.6 Analysis**

Page 66, second paragraph, third line, amend 'retain' to read 'retail'.

Waste Management

Following the submission of amended plans, Waste Management has advised that the plans now demonstrate that a refuse vehicle can access the property adequately and the amendment to the parking space layout addresses previous concerns relating to access. The applicant has advised that waste and recycling would be undertaken by a private licensed waste carrier, which Waste Management advise would be acceptable. Therefore, the proposal would comply with policy.

**No change to the recommendation.**

**Agenda Item 5c: 06/2018/0884  
Bushells Farm, Mill Lane, PR3 2BJ  
Pages 79 – 101**

**Changes:**

**Section 3.5 Consultation Responses**

One additional representation has been received from a local resident. The representation states that there are stark differences between the consultation response from County Highways and the summary of the consultation response set out in the committee report. The local resident is concerned that County Highways do not find the development acceptable but the application is recommended for approval.

The consultation response from County Highways (dated 20 September 2018) has been publically available since 21 September 2018. The summary of their written response and further discussions between County Highways, the applicant and the case officer is provided on pages 82, 87, 88 and 89 of the committee report.

The consultation response, in full, from County Highways (dated 20 September 2018) is attached.

The outstanding concern of County Highways relates to local highway network capacity. Page 3 of the consultation response from County Highways (dated 20 September 2018) states that they are unable to support further development until a (junction) modelling exercise is complete. This was initially expected to be complete by October 2018 but to date the modelling exercise remains incomplete. Therefore County Highways do not have any evidence to justify their concerns relating to the cumulative impacts of development on local highway network capacity. Therefore if the Council were to refuse this application on highways grounds it would have no evidence to call to support its decision on that ground at an appeal against the refusal of planning permission. Furthermore, by County Highways own admission (on page 3 of their response) there may well be spare capacity on the network to support development. As stated on page 89 of the committee report, in such circumstances the Council cannot substantiate a reason for refusal on highways grounds and there is no reason to delay the determination of the application based on currently unsubstantiated concerns that County Highways have indicated may in any event fall away.

**No change to recommendation.**

---