

8 July 2014

Dear Councillor

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - TUESDAY, 8TH JULY 2014

I am now able to enclose, for consideration at the above meeting of the Development Control Committee, the following report that provides an update of events that have taken place since the agenda was published.

Addendum

6 **Addendum** (Pages 3 - 8)

Yours sincerely



Gary Hall
Chief Executive

Cathryn Filbin
Democratic and Member Services Officer
E-mail: cathryn.filbin@chorley.gov.uk
Tel: (01257) 515123
Fax: (01257) 515150

Distribution

If you need this information in a different format, such as larger print or translation, please get in touch on 515151 or chorley.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

COMMITTEE REPORT		
REPORT OF	MEETING	DATE
Director of Public Protection, Streetscene and Community	Development Control Committee	8 July 2014

ADDENDUM

ITEM 3a-14/00514/REMAJ – Plot 4400 Buckshaw Avenue, Buckshaw Village

The recommendation remains as per the original report

2 further letters of objection have been received setting out the following issues:

Whilst I fully encourage new businesses to the area, I feel it's a bit 'overkill' for two National Pub Chain operators with very similar offerings to open new sites directly across the road from each other . I don't think having two new pubs within immediate vicinity of each other will attract new people into the area merely dilute the footfall to both which could result in price off promotions etc which ultimately could impact on small local independent operators like myself . One pub will be an asset, two is simply one pub too many in my opinion.

I am unsure as to why a planning applications for another chain pub is being considered directly across the road from one already approved. We will then have the large hungry horse, sea view and bobbin mill pubs. Is there a requirement for a 4th or will this in years to come be a derelict site? Each side of the village has been catered for already. The main entrance to the commercial area will be to be greeted by two pub chains. Harvester is not offering anything different to the area, it's the same style of convenience family food as across the road. What impression of the village are we hoping to give? My issue isn't necessarily that they are all next to the school as children will go into restaurants with their parents though Trinty would then have the licensed Hub and two licensed pubs surrounding it. When the government are trying to address young people drinking we are almost shoving it in the faces of our little ones.

Condition 9 within the agenda (agenda page 20) was imposed in response to the Police Architectural Liaison response, the applicant has raised concerns that the licence for the premises has been issued and that there are no such requirements that have been imposed. In addition it is clear that no such condition was imposed upon the pub application considered at the June Committee. As the two sites are in close proximity and comparable then the imposed conditions should be consistent unless otherwise justified. In this instance and subject to discussion with the Police and Licencing colleagues then the condition could either be modified or removed.

The recommendation has changed as follows:

That delegated authority is given to officers in association with Chair and Vice Chair to consider the appropriateness of Condition 9 and the need for the condition and to remove or amend the condition as appropriate.

ITEM 3b-14/00271/FULMAJ – 107 - 113 Chorley Road, Adlington, Chorley, PR6 9LP

The recommendation remains as per the original report

One further neighbour letter has been received. This expresses concern about his ability to read the plans and relate them to the physical relationship between buildings on and adjacent to the site. A telephone conversation between the neighbour and the case officer has taken place and these relationships have been explained. Concern is also expressed about the potential for the loss of trees at the western end of the site. The agent confirms that these trees are to remain and a condition has already been suggested that will secure this. The neighbour also expresses concern regarding the location of the bin store as he believes that this will cause unacceptable noise and disturbance. The bin store is considered to be located in the most appropriate location and it is not considered that this will cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of the neighbouring residential property.

Whilst the parking arrangement falls short of the policy requirement, which requires two spaces per two-bedroomed dwelling, LCC Highways have confirmed that they are satisfied that parking provision is acceptable in this location.

Condition 5 – Details of parking layout – This condition has been deleted following the receipt of additional details from the agent. Re-consultation on these details has been undertaken.

Please note the figure for S.106 Agreement contributions should read £18,880.00.

ITEM 3c-14/00429/FULMAJ– Chorley Rugby Union Club, Chancery Road, Astley Village, Chorley

The recommendation remains as per the original report.

The description of the application has been amended so it now no longer includes changing the main pitch from grass to artificial. The main pitch will remain as grass as originally approved. The description of the development is now:

Section 73 application to vary condition no.5 (approved plans) of planning permission no. 13/00082/FULMAJ (which was for the erection of 50 no. residential dwellings and the redevelopment of existing rugby club and associated facilities including floodlighting columns) to change the size and design of the clubhouse building and make alterations to the parking.

The Rugby Club have provided further information relating to why the scheme has been re-designed including the cost of the previously approved building compared to that now proposed:

The Trust decided to re-examine the design of The Pavilion following meetings I had last Autumn with Council Officers to consider the relationship between our development and the Council sports facilities on Westway. The Council Officers made it clear that as we saw our development as Phase One of a Chorley Sports Campus some form of link to the Westway pitches would be a reinforcement and enhancement to Community Leisure Provision. For example - there are no changing rooms at Westway but if the Trust could incorporate into its development additional changing facilities that could be made available for Council controlled Community Use it may be possible to enhance the pitch provisions on Westway. This was our re-design decision starting point.

We therefore commissioned a firm of Architects with proven expertise in the provision of leisure and sporting facilities to work with the Trust on re-evaluating our Pavilion design. At the same time we decided to manage the construction of our facilities - rather than Persimmon performing the construction (as their expertise lay in the area of house building not leisure facilities provision). We therefore appointed an organisation to Construction Manage the project who had previously

worked with our Architects. Therefore, the Trust now has direct control over the design and construction of the development which will also mean that the sub-contracting opportunities that will arise will be opened up to local applications from local businesses and individuals which could open up further community benefits to Chorley from the Trust development - this is in addition to the employment opportunities created by the Trust development which were reported to Committee last July.

As we then progressed in our review of the development we completely re-evaluated the original Pavilion building design. The original Persimmon design for the Pavilion, which received Planning Approval last August, used expensive building techniques, was labour intensive and had a longer construction period than our current proposal which would have required more man - hours to complete the works. The shell and core construction costs of for the Persimmon approved proposal gave a cost of £1,509 per square metre.

*The current proposal before Committee ensures that the design for the project works harder and indeed incorporates value engineering; furthermore it uses more efficient construction techniques such as Structural Steelwork, curtain walling and partitioning; In addition it also accommodates a greater level of sustainability by the use of Photo Voltaic Panels; Rainwater Harvesting and LED Lighting. The current design also provides for larger and an increased number of changing rooms which together with 'built in' removable partitions in the function room area adds considerably to the benefits of the Trust project to the Community in general. However, the shell and core construction costs for the current proposal before Committee of £1,350 per square metre which represents **a saving of £159 per square metre** compared to the Persimmon proposal approved by Committee in August 2013 - have allowed the Trust to invest in the additional Community and Ecological benefits of the development listed. Therefore, the final outcome of our proposal is still cash neutral as we have reinvested savings achieved by the Trust (described above) in a much improved Community facility with sustainability and a high degree of "future proofing".*

The following condition has been amended to reflect the latest site layout showing the increased number of parking spaces as requested by Lancashire County Council Highways:

Title	Drawing Reference	Received date
Planning Layout	JB/CRC/PL1 Rev D	25 th June 2014
Proposed Floodlighting	000348 E01	20 th May 2014
New Stand and Clubhouse Section A	22937 L(2-) 05 Rev E	20 th June 2014
New Stand and Clubhouse Section C	22937 L(2-) 07 Rev E	20 th June 2014
New Stand and Clubhouse Section B	22937 L(2-) 06 Rev E	20 th June 2014
Chorley Rugby Club Plans	22937 Rev E	20 th June 2014
New Clubhouse Elevations	22937 L(2-)04 Rev E	20 th June 2014
New Clubhouse Ground Floor Plan	22937 L(2-)08 Rev A	20 th June 2014
New Clubhouse First Floor Plan	22937 L(2-)09	20 th June 2014
Location Plan	CRC/LP1	24 th April 2014
The Hatfield	HAT	24 th April 2014
The Roseberry	ROS	24 th April 2014
The Cranthorne	CRA	24 th April 2014
The Cherryburn	CHR	24 th April 2014
The Winster	WIN	24 th April 2014
The Barrington	BAR	24 th April 2014
They Newby	NEW	24 th April 2014

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

The following two conditions have been added. The first one requires details of the fences and walls to be erected around the dwellings to be submitted (as they have not been submitted with the current application), and the second one requires elevation details of the proposed conservatories to be submitted, as although conservatoires are shown on the site plan, no elevational details have been submitted.

Before the development hereby permitted is first commenced, full details of the alignment, height and appearance of all fences and walls and gates to be erected on the housing part of the development (notwithstanding any such detail shown on previously submitted plan(s)) shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No dwelling shall be occupied until all fences and walls shown in the approved details to bound its plot have been erected in conformity with the approved details. Other fences and walls shown in the approved details shall have been erected in conformity with the approved details prior to substantial completion of the development.

Reason: To ensure a visually satisfactory form of development and to provide reasonable standards of privacy to residents.

Before the dwellings hereby permitted are commenced, elevation details of the conservatories to be erected at the dwellings hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (the position of the conservatories is as shown on the approved site plan ref: JB/CRC/PL1 Rev D).

Reason: To ensure the design is visually appropriate to the locality.

ITEM 3e-13/01012/FUL – Ivy Cottage Preston Road Coppull

The recommendation remains as per the original report

A further letter of objection has been received that had been forwarded to members however since that letter was received officers have been in contact with the applicants agent to seek to amend the details of the application to overcome the concerns raised in that letter which in essence are related to two new parking areas.

The applicants agent has confirmed that they are willing to remove the reference to the four additional spaces being provided.

The objectors agent has indicated that the objection would be removed on the basis that the spaces are removed from the consideration, which they have and on that basis it is considered that the objection circulated has been overcome.

The following conditions have been amended:

Condition number 4 be amended to read:

The hardstanding in front of the field gate to the North East of Ivy Cottage shall be retained in perpetuity and made available for parking at all times in association with the extension hereby approved.

Reason: to ensure sufficient parking is available at this site, to meet the needs of the individual household and also to meet the care needs of the applicants daughter.

ITEM 3f-14/00551/OUT – Ricmarlo Preston Nook Ecclestone**The recommendation remains as per the original report**

1 further letter of objection have been received setting out the following issues:

This land has been conservation land and natural wildlife area for many years until it was levelled by the new owners overnight with a bulldozer. The land is well outside the planning line and in a potential flood risk zone due to it being adjacent to a river. Previous applications on neighbouring properties in an identical position have been refused. My home would be overlooking the roofs, chimney pots and windows of the proposed houses. In my opinion, having lived all my life in the village there's enough housing development in Ecclestone of brownfield sites already without further vandalism for commercial gain.

ITEM 3h-14/00149/FUL – Land 35M North-East Of Rose Cottage, White Coppice, Heapey**The recommendation remains as per the original report**

Members are reminded that following a previous site visit it was resolved that the applicant would be required to remove the stone from the site from the former embankment and to reduce the area of hardstanding to its original size. It is confirmed that the stone has now been removed from the site and that the hardstanding area has been reduced in size by the laying of top soil with grass seed.

Members are reminded that should the applicant wish to enlarge the area of hardstanding in the future, an application for planning permission would be required.

Cllr Gordon France has asked that the following comments be included for consideration by Members:

“ I note the planning officer, Ian Heywood , considered the removal of the dam wall to have little effect on the view from the cricket field ,as a fell walker I can say that from the Great Hill path this has considerably changed the landscape ,and we now see what is open marsh land.

At the moment, without the dam wall, this area runs to the edge of the cricket field. Because of the ongoing drainage problems this area will have to remain like this for some time. Also at the last planning application it was uncertain as to the ownership of some of the area. Has this now been resolved?

I realise that planning can be given without clear ownership of the land but think in this instance it could do with verifying. Also local residents have raised the issue of the gate just before Rose Cottage, as this restricts collection of waste and involves the waste vehicle having to reverse out when previously there has been a turning circle.

I wish to object to this application on the grounds that it has changed a lovely rural village, which has previously been used in TV settings forever. I appreciate that the draining of the lodge was a major effect and this did not need planning permission but removal of the dam wall means what's as become open marshland runs right into the village.”

Response to Cllr France's comments:

The land ownership issues are not a material planning consideration in this case, however it is understood that the issues previously mentioned at Committee are still ongoing and are as yet unresolved.

The gate adjacent to Rose Cottage was in situ prior to any of the recent works being undertaken and does not form part of the consideration here. The erection of the gate does not require planning permission.
