

## **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

TUESDAY, 27TH MARCH 2018, 6.30 PM

THE LANCASTRIAN, TOWN HALL, CHORLEY

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 printed.

<b>Agenda No</b>	<b>Item</b>
------------------	-------------

5	<b>ADDENDUM</b>
---	-----------------

(Pages 3 - 6)

GARY HALL  
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Electronic copies sent to Members of the Development Control Committee

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](http://chorley.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

C O M M I T T E E R E P O R T		
REPORT OF	MEETING	DATE
Director (Customer and Digital)	Development Control Committee	27 March 2018

ADDENDUM
----------

**ITEM 3a - 17/00710/OUTMAJ – Camelot Theme Park, Park Hall Road, Charnock Richard**

**The recommendation remains as per the original report**

4 No. further letters of objection have been received setting out the following issues:

- Highway safety and capacity impact
- Lack of education provision
- Flood risk
- The development would not provide adequate local services
- Footpaths are too narrow
- There is no housing shortfall in Chorley
- Lack of local infrastructure or amenities
- Increased use of public rights of way would impact on the amenity of nearby neighbours.
- Any upgrading works would have to be agreed with the land owners
- The public right of way is not suited to pushchairs prams and mobility scooters.
- No right of way agreement exists.
- The development is not sustainable as the footpaths cannot be upgraded.

Comments have also been received from Cllr Leadbetter and Cllr Whittaker in advance of the committee. These are set out as follows:

**Cllr Leadbetter** states as follows:

“On 5 August 2014 I represented the majority of people in Charnock Richard, Heskin and Coppull West and also the surrounding villages, including Eccleston and Wrightington, in opposing the planning application for up to 418 houses at the site of the former Camelot Theme Park.

At that time I mentioned that, in 882AD, the remains of St Cuthbert were (for a short time) buried in Park Hall woods and that if that planning application had been granted then the remains of Chorley’s Local Plan might as well be buried under the footings of the first property.

Nothing has changed and to say I am disappointed, by the officer recommendation, is a significant understatement.

Members will be aware of the Chorley Borough Local Plan and that, in that plan, Charnock Richard is identified for small scale development and limited infill within the village, this application is neither, small scale, infill, or in the village. Indeed this is

development on a large scale and out of proportion to the existing villages of Heskin and Charnock Richard.

Members will also be aware that this development is a site within the green belt and in order to overcome the harm to the green belt very special circumstances have to exist, it is the role of the developer to demonstrate that very special circumstances do exist and that the development is required.

The developer's application suggests that very special circumstances do exist, the planning officers suggest the recommendation is finely balanced and so it can be reasoned that the application can be refused as easily as it can be approved.

The very special circumstances mentioned are, as they were in 2014, just circumstances of any development and are certainly not very special, as is required for any development in the green belt whether that be previously developed land or not. The weightings detailed in the officers' report are extremely subjective and, therefore, would fail under detailed scrutiny.

Without this development Chorley Borough has in excess of the required 5 years' supply of approved, deliverable, housing and this has been ratified by a planning inspector, at a recent appeal, for building on safeguarded land which is land allocated for building, whilst the Camelot site is, not only, not allocated for development but is also one of the most unsustainable sites in the local plan.

I trust the committee will refuse this planning application on the grounds that:

1. There is significant harm to the openness of the green belt and no very special circumstances, that outweigh this harm, have been identified.
2. There is no need, Chorley already has in excess of the required 5 years supply of housing and a plan (confirmed by an inspector at a recent appeal) that delivers the Chorley Borough housing requirements to 2026 meaning there is no requirement to release additional land for housing in the Borough at this time. In fact, releasing additional sites now increases the requirement for more sites to be released in the future and this cannot be achieved without adversely affecting the green belt
3. The site is not sustainable for many reasons including, but not limited to, health and social care, school places, convenience shopping and the need to access the site by car, which is the most unsustainable method of access.

In summary, I think that people recognise this site will at some point in the future be developed, on a small scale, for housing. However this development is still the wrong development, in the wrong place, at the wrong time. It is unsustainable, is out of proportion to the existing villages of Heskin and Charnock Richard, adds nothing positive to the surrounding villages and is not accompanied by the very special circumstances that would permit development, in fact the circumstances provided are those that exist in any development and are not special to this particular development.

I ask that the committee do what is right, go against the officer recommendation, and refuse this planning application."

**Cllr Whittaker** states as follows:

"I have been advised that I should not sit on Development Control Committee for this application having spoken on this site before. I have reluctantly accepted the advice

and will speak as a ward Councillor. My fellow Ward Councillor Cllr Leadbetter has spelled out eloquently the reasons why he seeks refusal. I very much share Cllr Leadbetter's views which we both garnered from public meetings in Charnock Richard and Heskin where residents AND Parish Councils overwhelmingly expressed opposition. I will expand on this statement in my address to Committee"

**The following additional conditions are recommended:**

The office and employment units hereby permitted shall be constructed to achieve a minimum Building Research Establishment (BREEAM) standard of 'very good'. Within 6 months of occupation a 'Post Construction Stage' assessment and a Final Certificate shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority certifying that a BREEAM standard of 'very good' has been achieved.

*Reason: In the interests of minimising the environmental impact of the development.*

Prior to the commencement of each phase or sub-phase of the development a 'Design Stage' assessment and related certification shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out entirely in accordance with the approved assessment and certification.

*Reason: In the interests of minimising the environmental impact of the development.*

Prior to the occupation of the office and employment units hereby permitted a letter of assurance; detailing how the building(s) has achieved BREEAM has been issued by a licensed BREEAM Assessor/Auditor and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

*Reason: In the interests of minimising the environmental impact of the development.*

**The original report has been amended as follows:**

Paragraphs 124 and 125 refer to substantial weight being attached to the improvements to the security of the site and in addressing the poor condition of the site. Members should note, however, that this is an error and should refer to moderate weight in line with the table of very special circumstances set out at paragraph 122.

---

This page is intentionally left blank