

22/0577/FUL Former Brook Shed, Earby

Additional details have been submitted in response to the Environment Agency's (EA) comments and the EA have been reconsulted.

Amended plans have been received showing revised proposed materials and window designs for the plots facing New Road. The proposed materials for those plots are reconstituted stone walls, concrete tile roofs, with white uPVC fascias and soffits. The materials of the windows and doors are not specified, colours are given as brown and black respectively. The proposed elevations continue to show uPVC verge caps. As detailed in the report those plots should use natural materials, which can be controlled by the recommended conditions.

The recommendation remains to Delegate Grant Consent as recommended in the Committee report.

23/0067/REM: Land to the NE of Meadow Way, Barnoldswick

Following the publication of the committee report, the applicant has submitted further detail relating to the drainage strategy. This has clarified where the surface water is to drain to, which is a surface water sewer. The drainage strategy has also clarified the position in terms of the surface water discharge rate which is to be no greater than 6.8l/sec, which was set out in condition 10 of the appeal decision.

A response has been received from the Lead Local Flood Authority following the submission of this additional detail.

*Lead Local Flood Authority – Site Specific Advice (received on 24/04/2023)*

*The following advice is provided to inform the applicant and the Local Planning Authority of our expectations at the discharge of conditions stage:*

*The Lead Local Flood Authority recognises the updated documents provided by the applicant which addresses the LLFA's previous advice regarding, discharging to the combined sewer, the final discharge rate, and the inclusion of an urban creep allowance.*

*The applicant has confirmed that the surface water is intended to discharge to the surface water sewer, rather than the combined sewer network or the Leeds and Liverpool Canal.*

*At discharge of condition stage, it is the expectation of the Lead Local Flood Authority that sufficient attention to detail regarding both the surface water during construction phase as well as the management and maintenance of the sustainable drainage system. As a guide the following examples of evidence are what the Lead Local Flood Authority would expect to be provided.*

There is no objection from the LLFA in relation to this application. The applicant has clarified their position in relation to surface water drainage.

The Environment Agency have also responded to re-consultation, following clarification on the outflow of the surface water drainage. There is no objection from

the Environment Agency and they are satisfied with the foul water discharging to an existing combined sewer.

The Canal & River Trust have also responded to re-consultation, with the following response:

*We request that the Local Planning Authority ensure that there is appropriate capacity within the existing culverts to manage the proposed additional peak flow that would occur with the new connections proposed. This would be necessary in order to ensure that water will not pool upstream of the canal, and to ensure that no erosion issues will occur below the waterway (which could occur if the culvert is at over capacity). Any water pooling or erosion could result in land instability associated with the structure of the canal, contrary to the wider aims of paragraphs 174 (part e) and 183 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF); which requires that development does not contribute towards instability.*

*We note from the submitted details that the applicant intends to confirm final pipe sizes (and capacity) prior to any connection. We request that the Local Planning Authority ensure this is undertaken. Confirmation could be reserved through the use of appropriately worded condition.*

However, the Canal & River Trust's comments relate to culverts which are outside of the application red edge and the surface water discharge rate has already been considered and set by the Inspector in the previously allowed appeal decision. As such, it would not be reasonable for a condition requiring the applicant to undertake investigations and modelling of peak rates through infrastructure which is outside of their control. The surface water discharge rate has already been considered and included within the condition on the appeal decision. The Canal & River Trust have since confirmed that they are content that the culvert would have to be assessed as part of a United Utilities connection because they are the custodians of the culverts under the canal in question.

The applicant has provided the following commentary on the culvert and the surface water connection point:

*United Utilities have accepted that assuming infiltration is not viable they will accept Surface Water flows discharging the sewer passing under the canal. By virtue of them offering this as a solution UU will have considered capacity of their network and confirmed that the additional flows from the site will not pose a capacity issue. This is the process they go through in order to offer the outfall location. As also previously discussed, we are in the process of negating an infiltration solution with UU.*

The drainage strategy is acceptable and there are no objections to the scheme based on this.

23/0211/FUL: Wedacre Farm, Skipton Road, Gisburn

Consultation Response has been received from Ribble Valley Borough Council, there is no objection.

There is no alteration to the recommendation which is for delegate grant consent, subject to the publicity expiration.