

Planning Committee

Tuesday, 13th July 2021, 6.30 pm

The Lancastrian, Town Hall, Chorley and via Microsoft Teams

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

Agenda No Item

6 **Addendum**

| (Pages 3 - 8)

Gary Hall
Chief Executive

Electronic agendas sent to Members of the Planning Committee Councillor June Molyneaux (Chair), Councillor Alex Hilton (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Aaron Beaver, Martin Boardman, Magda Cullens, Gordon France, Peter Gabbott, Danny Gee, Tom Gray, Harold Heaton, Keith Iddon, Alistair Morwood and Alan Whittaker.

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

[To view the procedure for public questions/ speaking click here and scroll to page 119](#)

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 of Planning and Development	Planning Committee	13 July 2021

ADDENDUM

ITEM 3a - 20/01149/FUL – Land 60M West Of No. 3 Castle Walks

The recommendation remains as per the original report

To assist members, the definition of open space is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and is provided below:

Open space: All open space of public value, including not just land, but also areas of water (such as rivers, canals, lakes and reservoirs) which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation and can act as a visual amenity.

The Council's Open Space study (2019) defines the primary purposes of amenity greenspace as:

Opportunities for informal activities close to home or work or enhancement of the appearance of residential or other areas.

The applicant has submitted the following comments:

We have just been on the Chorley planning website and discovered the Committee report dated 15th June.

I would like to respond to the further objections that have been received as these paint us in a very bad light and insinuates that we have a disregard for planning which is not the case.

Firstly though I would like to point out that when we bought the land it was completely impassable you could not walk across it and even we were not prepared for the amount of fly tipping, the burnt out caravan, abandoned farmers trailers, building rubble, etc. that was hidden beneath.

Point 1 the clearing of trees not included in the notification 20/00992/TCON. Could you or the person who lodged the objection please enlighten us as to which trees these were. We employed the services of a reputable company of tree surgeons, initially to trim the hedges, it was here that we were told we needed to apply to planning, when we got the planning, the work was carried out exactly as agreed, please see attached planning documents. The land was cleared of sapling growth and scrub and 4 silver birch were removed, these were mainly tall trunks with some wispy leaves at the top, they were not healthy trees, we would never remove any trees without good reason.

Point 2 Considerable reprofiling by excavation and the laying of a large area of hardstanding.

This hardstanding is an area of road gravel, which will eventually grass over. It was necessary to do this so we would be able to park on the land and turn vehicles around, so we are not obstructing or backing up on Yarrow Close, this is a safety issue.

Point 3 Storage of heavy plant machinery.

There is no heavy plant being stored on the land there is currently a mini digger and a small dumper on the site. These are necessary to manage the land in its clearance.

Point 4 Considerable disruption to local residents moving heavy plant over the unadopted section of Yarrow Close.

As I have said the land was completely impassable and full of all kinds of debris and building rubble, so on 2 occasions we have hired a digger, on both occasions my husband has made sure that the machine was delivered after 9.30am so as to avoid the school run times. We have at all times been conscious of the people on the walkway and on Yarrow Close.

We are very conscious of the environment and like to think we improve where we can, we do want to plant more trees and make the site a pleasant place to be, encouraging wildlife of all kinds, we have no wish to have formal gardens, just a house in a meadow land but all land needs a certain amount of maintaining.

Officer comment:

Members of the public are entitled to make representations on planning application as part of the notification process. Comments received are reported within the body of the committee report, or in the Addendum, depending at which point they are received in the application process.

The committee report and the Addendum are both public documents which are published on the Council's website.

It is not the role of the case officer to engage in discussions between objectors and the applicant, or to clarify matters which have been raised between each party, except where they are relevant and material considerations in the determination of the application in question.

The matter in relation to the clearing of trees and the application 20/00992/TCON is not part of this assessment.

Hardstanding has been laid on the site which the applicant states is a safety issue. There is no record of planning permission for this hardstanding, however, it is not part of the assessment of this application, as it is a separate matter.

Storage of heavy plant and machinery – again, this is a separate matter and not material to this application.

Disruption to residents – again, this is a separate matter and not material to this application.

1 no. further objection has been received:

Risk of flooding

Please can councillors seriously consider the risk of flooding to neighbouring properties. I appreciate that a flood risk assessment of the proposed development site has been carried out and reference has been made within the report to highway drainage at the carriageway at Yarrow Close. Attached is an image of the area in Yarrow Close taken in October 2020 after some heavy but not prolonged rainfall clearly showing surface water that the drains do not have capacity to deal with. Parked vehicles were moved as a precaution and the Castle Walks PROW was not freely passable by pedestrians due to the accumulation of water. This is a regular occurrence during the wetter months and the standing water along Castle Walks is adjacent to the rear of the properties on Yarrow Close.



Disruption to current residents

Since preparatory work has commenced on the site, vehicles have been parked either directly in front of or across from the driveway of the property adjacent to the site access, which has resulted in restricted access to vehicles. Residents at this property have had to (i) wait for a contractor to return from lunch to enable their vehicle to be moved and (ii) abandoned an attempt to move a vehicle as unable to attract the attention of the vehicle owner who was operating a digger on the site. This does not include occasions where access has been blocked/restricted and the owners have not required their vehicles. In addition, heavy vehicles have been using Yarrow Close to gain site access, which I expect will increase should the application be granted and proposed work commence. This resident's vehicles have been damaged in the recent past due to lorries delivering to building works on Yarrow Close and it is a real concern that parked private vehicles are at risk.

Officer comment:

Flood Risk – In relation to the development itself, the Environment Agency are satisfied that the development will not cause flooding elsewhere. In relation to highway drainage and capacity, this is a matter for Lancashire County Council if it falls within the adopted highway.

Disruption to residents – as set out earlier in the addendum, any works that have been carried out are separate to this planning application.
Damage to vehicles from construction works and indiscriminate / unneighbourly parking is not a planning matter.

ITEM 3d - 20/01379/FUL– Buckshaw Hall, Knight Avenue, Buckshaw Village, Chorley, PR7 7HW

The recommendation remains as per the original report

A further representation in support of the application has been submitted:

I have supported this particular development from the beginning. As I have stated previously I am very keen to see something done with Buckshaw Hall to see it restored and loved is a must.

The proposed erection of four dwellings with garages and an additional triple garage adjacent Buckshaw Hall, for me will make good use of that site and ensure its future. The site and surrounding homes will certainly benefit from it as it will no longer be seen as an eyesore.

Conditions

A landscaping plan has been submitted which is considered acceptable. There is therefore no requirement for the first part of proposed condition 14 on the agenda (which requires a landscaping plan to be submitted before commencement of the development). This condition has therefore been amended so it now secures implementation of the submitted scheme as follows:

All landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details within the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of any buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is the

sooner, and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.

Reason: To ensure that a satisfactory landscaping scheme for the development is carried out to mitigate the impact of the development and secure a high quality design.

The approved plans condition has also been updated to include reference to the submitted landscaping plan as follows:

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans below:

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

Title	Plan Ref	Received On
Proposed Triple Garage	20/076/G03	22 December 2021
Proposed Double Garage	20/076/G02	22 December 2021
Proposed Site Plan	20/076/P01 Rev C	25 June 2021
Plot 1 House Type (5H2097)	20/076/SK05	25 June 2021
Plot 2 House Type (5H2137)	20/076/SK03 Rev A	25 June 2021
Plot 3 House Type (5H2243)	20/076/SK04	22 December 2020
Plot 4 House Type C (5H2097)	20/076/SK02 Rev A	25 June 2021
Landscape Proposals	2345_01 Rev C	30 June 2021

ITEM 3f - 21/00362/FUL – 209 Blackburn Road, Heapey, Chorley

The recommendation remains as per the original report/

(1)No. further letter of objection has been received setting out the following issues:

- There are existing traffic problems in the village cause by all the existing businesses and the proposal will make this worse.
 - A proposal for housing in the village would add to these traffic problems.
-

ITEM 3h - 21/00261/FUL – Land adjacent to 69-70 Long Meadows Chorley

The application has been withdrawn from the agenda by officers to give the applicant the opportunity to address the reasons for refusal.

This page is intentionally left blank