

Planning Committee

Tuesday, 12th September 2023, 6.30 pm

Council Chamber, Town Hall, Chorley and [YouTube](#)

Agenda

Apologies

1 **Declarations of Any Interests**

Members are reminded of their responsibility to declare any pecuniary interest in respect of matters contained in this agenda.

If you have a pecuniary interest you must withdraw from the meeting. Normally you should leave the room before the business starts to be discussed. You do, however, have the same right to speak as a member of the public and may remain in the room to enable you to exercise that right and then leave immediately. In either case you must not seek to improperly influence a decision on the matter.

2 **Minutes of meeting Tuesday, 15 August 2023 of Planning Committee**

(Pages 3 - 6)

3 **Planning applications to be determined**

The Head of Planning and Enforcement has submitted three planning applications to be determined (enclosed).

Plans to be considered will be displayed at the meeting or may be viewed in advance by following the links to the current planning applications on our [website](#).

a **20/01378/FULMAJ - Formerly Mormon Church, Water Street, Chorley**

(Pages 7 - 50)

b **23/00616/PIP - Whitegates, 75 Gorsey Lane, Mawdesley**

(Pages 51 - 74)

c **23/00445/FUL - Land 150M West Of Oakfields and 197 Runshaw Lane, Euxton**

(Pages 75 - 96)

4 **Any urgent business previously agreed with the Chair**

5 **Addendum**

(Pages 97 -
100)

Chris Sinnott
Chief Executive

Electronic agendas sent to Members of the Planning Committee Councillor June Molyneux (Chair), Councillor Alex Hilton (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Sarah Ainsworth, Karen Derbyshire, Gordon France, Danny Gee, Samir Khan, Alistair Morwood, Chris Snow, Craige Southern, Neville Whitham 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](#)

a 23/00430/FUL Euxton Mills Hotel Wigan Road Euxton Chorley PR7 6JD

Public speaker: Paul Bowker (Objector).

After careful consideration, it was proposed by Councillor Danny Gee, seconded by Councillor Sarah Ainsworth, and subsequently **resolved unanimously, that planning permission be granted subject to conditions.**

b 23/00038/FUL Lower House Fold Farm Trigg Lane Heapey Chorley PR6 9BZ

After careful consideration, it was proposed by Councillor Gordon France, seconded by Councillor Danny Gee, and subsequently, **resolved unanimously that planning permission be granted subject to conditions.**

c 23/00126/OUT Wood Lane Farm Wood Lane Mawdesley Ormskirk L40 2RL

Public speaker: Bryan Youlden (Agent).

After careful consideration, it was proposed by Councillor Craig Southern, seconded by Councillor Gordon France, and subsequently, **resolved unanimously that planning permission be granted subject to conditions and a S106 legal agreement.**

d 23/00114/REM Latvian Consulate Pemberton House Farm Park Hall Road Charnock Richard

After careful consideration, it was proposed by Councillor Alan Whittaker, seconded by Councillor Danny Gee, and subsequently, **resolved unanimously that reserved matters consent be granted for the details of appearance subject to conditions.**

e 23/00424/FUL Mayfield Blue Stone Lane Mawdesley Ormskirk

Public speakers: Simon Miskell (Objector), and Alastair Skelton (Agent).

After careful consideration, it was proposed by Councillor Alex Hilton, seconded by Councillor Adrian Lowe, and subsequently, **resolved (8 for, 2 against, 1 abstention) that planning permission be granted subject to conditions.**

f 23/00463/FUL Mediterranean At Robin Hood Blue Stone Lane Mawdesley

Public speakers: Ian Clayton (Objector), and Claire Wilkinson (Agent).

After careful consideration, it was proposed by Councillor Gordon France, seconded by Councillor Craig Southern, and **resolved unanimously that planning permission be granted subject to conditions.**

(Councillor Hilton left the meeting 19:36)

**g 23/00073/FULMAJ Coppull Enterprise Centre Mill Lane Coppull Chorley
PR7 5AN**

Public speaker: Paul Clarke (Applicant).

After careful consideration, it was proposed by Councillor Adrian Lowe, seconded by Councillor Gordon France, and was subsequently, **resolved unanimously that planning permission be granted subject to conditions within the report and full details of the type of fence, to be submitted to the Council.**

15 Appeals Report

Resolved: that the Appeals Report be noted.

Chair

Date

This page is intentionally left blank

APPLICATION REPORT – 20/01378/FULMAJ

Validation Date: 22 December 2020

Ward: Chorley North West

Type of Application: Major Full Planning

Proposal: Erection of three storey apartment block comprising of 20 no. apartments, including vehicular access to Water Street and associated parking

Location: Formerly Mormon Church Water Street Chorley

Case Officer: Mike Halsall

Applicant: Gradus Homes Ltd.

Agent: LMP Ltd.

Consultation expiry: 13 April 2023

Decision due by: 30 September 2023 (Extension of time agreed)

RECOMMENDATION

1. It is recommended that planning permission is granted subject to conditions and a Section 106 legal agreement to secure financial contributions for:
 - Public Open Space - £48,660 (£34,660 if private maintenance proposed)
 - Affordable Housing - £51,340

SITE DESCRIPTION

2. The application site is located within the core settlement area of Chorley, close to Chorley town centre and within St. Laurence's Conservation Area. It comprises vacant land following the demolition of a building in the 2000's which was used as a Mormon Church meeting room and has since become overgrown with vegetation. The topography of the area is distinctive and there is a steep increase in levels to the rear of the site up to Park Street and Park Road to the north west.
3. There is a terrace of traditional appearance to the south west of the site, and dwellings of more recent design style opposite the site on the other side of Water Street. The properties opposite have front gardens and parking areas, whilst those to the south west have small front gardens and a front boundary wall to define the curtilage. There is a distinctive stone stepped footpath to the north east and the grade II listed Chorley Unitarian Chapel to the north, in addition to locally listed buildings at The Old Manse and 2 Park Street.
4. Outline planning permission ref. 19/00909/OUTMAJ was granted at the site for the erection of up to eight dwellings, with all matters reserved, save for access, in January 2020. This permission has since lapsed. Prior to this, planning permission for the construction of a two-storey office building and associated car park was approved in April 2019 (ref. 18/00946/FUL).

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

5. Full planning permission is sought for the erection of a three-storey apartment block with rooms in the loft space, comprising of 20 no. apartments, including vehicular access to/from Water Street and associated parking. Each apartment would have two bedrooms.
6. The proposals would involve some ground levelling work and the introduction of a retaining wall, as depicted in a cross-section drawing (ref. 20/021/S01) and the site layout (ref. 20/021/P01 Rev B) submitted in support of the application. The proposed building would be set back from the retained (albeit reduced in height) stone frontage wall by approximately 3m and this area would be soft landscaped.
7. Some off-street parking would be provided to the rear of the building whilst the main parking area will be contained within a new car park to the east side of the site. The proposal seeks to be contained generally within the footprint of the demolished building and re-use some of the existing retaining walls, along the north (rear boundary). The proposal would necessitate the removal of some trees and those that remain would create an open green space to the rear of the site.

REPRESENTATIONS

8. Representations have been received from 17 addresses in objection to the proposal. The issues raised have been summarised below:
 - The design and materials are not in keeping with the Conservation Area / out of character / harmful to it
 - Flood risk
 - The plans include an area marked with a blue edge that forms part of a historic road, Teck Street, of which others have a right of access and so should not be developed
 - Insufficient level of parking
 - Out of scale with other residential properties
 - Overbearing
 - Waste collection – number of bins required
 - Groundwork has already taken place – tree and archaeology harm, coal mine risk
 - Tree loss
 - Ecological harm
 - Rat problems
 - Harm to mental health
 - Insufficient local services / amenities
 - Anti-social behaviour
 - Loss of light, privacy / overlooking
 - Insufficient local consultation
 - Doesn't fit the history of the site, previously three Victorian houses
 - Increased traffic, noise and disturbance
 - Highway safety
 - Health and safety concerns from mineshafts
 - Odours from bins and cooking
 - Loss of the wall to the front of the site
 - Land stability
 - Conflict with the St Laurence's Conservation Area Management Plan

CONSULTATIONS

9. Lancashire County Council Archaeology Service: have responded with no objection to the proposal and state the following:

"The proposed development has been identified in the Chorley Extensive Urban Survey (English Heritage/Lancashire CC, 2006) as lying in an area likely to contain archaeological remains dating to the medieval and/or Post-medieval periods.

Although the construction of the former Mormon Church, and its subsequent demolition sometime in 2007-09, will have caused some damage to any surviving remains, these works are not considered likely to have resulted in the total destruction of such remains across the whole of the site.

Consequently, I would advise that the applicant be required to undertake an archaeological watching brief on the proposed groundworks, and that work is secured by means of a suitably worded planning condition."

Lancashire County Council Archaeology Service have recommended the wording of a condition in accordance with the above.

10. The Coal Authority: have responded with no objection to the proposal and state the following:

"The Coal Authority concurs with the conclusion / recommendations of the Coal Mining Risk Assessment, dated 15 December 2020 based on the professional opinion of EnviroSolutions Ltd that there is currently a risk to the proposed development as a result of the recorded on-site mine entry (CA shaft ref: 358417-008). In order to mitigate the risk (confirm the exact location / condition of the mine shaft) and inform the extent of remedial / mitigatory measures that may be required to ensure that the development is safe and stable (NPPF paras. 178 and 179), intrusive site investigations should be undertaken prior to commencement of development."

The Coal Authority have recommended the wording for conditions in accordance with the above.

11. Greater Manchester Ecology Unit: have responded with no objection, subject to conditions.
12. Lancashire Police: Have responded with some suggestions for the applicant to incorporate into the scheme in order to minimise the risk of crime. This has been forwarded to the applicant's agent for consideration but has no impact on the proposal in Planning terms.
13. Tree Officer: has commented as follows:

"The proposal would see the majority of the trees along the front edge of the site, adjacent Water Street, removed. While the majority of the trees in the back half of the site, adjacent The Old Manse, Park street, retained.

None of the trees to be removed are of particular importance individually, though collectively they offer a fairly high level of visual amenity. Should the development go ahead, replanting should take place to replace the amenity in the long term. Retained trees should be protected through strict adherence to the recommendations contained within BS 5837:2012"

14. Environment Agency: have responded with no objection to the proposal but have made some informative comments for the applicant which would be attached to the decision notice, should planning permission should be granted. The information states that the River Chor is culverted under Water Street at this location and The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 require a permit to be obtained for specific works within 16 metres of the culvert.
15. Lancashire County Council Highway Services (LCC Highway Services): initially responded to request:
- sight lines be shown on the submitted drawing to ensure vehicles can egress the site safely and show any walls, hedges etc. within the sight lines be no higher than 1m;
 - vehicle tracking be provided to show a turning head can be accommodated within the site to enable refuse and emergency vehicles to turn within the site;
 - two secure cycle spaces be provided for each property;

- for the promotion of sustainable forms of transport and aid social inclusion it is requested that the applicant contributes towards a bicycle wheel ramp on the steps to the east of the site. The steps are part of the PROW and are Footpath 29;
- A Traffic Management Plan is provided to protect existing road users and to maintain the operation and safety of the local highway network and to minimise the impact of the construction works on the local highway network;
- The removal of a bus stop marking and poles; and
- A suite of conditions be attached to secure the above and other issues, such as the construction and marking out of the car parking spaces before the first occupation of any of the units.

Revised plans were subsequently submitted to the satisfaction of LCC Highway Services. It is not considered that a ramp is a suitable option due to harm to the historic character of the steps and so this part of the suggested scheme improvements has not been requested of the applicant.

16. Lead Local Flood Authority: initially objected to the proposal and requested the applicant provide further details, including the submission of an acceptable surface water sustainable drainage strategy. Following the submission of detailed drainage details from the applicant, the Lead Local Flood Authority responded to withdraw its objection and have recommended a suite of conditions to be attached to any grant of planning permission to secure the proposed drainage scheme and its ongoing management and maintenance.
17. United Utilities: have responded with no objection, subject to conditions.
18. Lancashire County Council (Education): No contribution is required from the proposal.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Principle of development

19. The National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) states that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. This means that development proposals that accord with the development plan should be approved without delay. One of the core principles of National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is that development should be focussed in locations that are sustainable. It is considered that the site is located in a sustainable location with good access to public transport and a wide range of amenities.
20. Chorley town is identified as a key service centre and the focus of growth and investments under Core Strategy policy 1 (b).
21. Policy V2 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026 states that within the settlement areas excluded from the green Belt, and identified on the Policies Map, there is a presumption in favour of appropriate sustainable development, subject to material planning considerations and compliance with other Development Plan policies.
22. Therefore, it is considered that the principle of the proposal is acceptable.

Impact on designated heritage asset

23. Policy BNE8 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026 seeks to protect and enhance designated heritage assets. The application site is located on Water Street within the St Lawrence's Conservation Area, and close to the grade II listed Chorley Unitarian Chapel. It lies opposite dwellings and a car park of entirely modern, late 20th Century era and of no particular historic, architectural or cultural significance and is at a significantly lower level to the Chorley Unitarian Chapel. Any proposed development would not, therefore, affect the setting or significance of this building.
24. The Council's heritage advisors, Growth Lancashire, have commented as follows:

“The approved St Laurence’s Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Proposals identifies the site as being a negative open space following demolition of the former Church building.

From my visit whilst the site is showing signs of natural regeneration, I agree that it is not a positive space in terms of the stated key characteristics of the CA. The site lies within Character Area 3: Water Street/Hollinshead Street/Union Street which is marked by the change in level from the higher Park Road/Park Street level to the lower Water Street level. The CAA identifies that this area has seen the most change within the conservation area with three storey buildings having been erected which have a neutral effect on the area’s quality, whilst key historic public buildings continue to have a positive influence.

Key to environment around this site are the ‘Chapel Steps’ which were originally constructed in the early 18th century to provide access to the Unitarian Chapel on Park Street. The steps were reconstructed in 1985.

I note that existing mature trees provide screening to the upper level of Park Street and from the lower level of Water Street there is little inter-visibility between the buildings.

The character around the site is residential with a mix of modern 2 storey and single storey dwellings opposite and a more traditional 2 storey brick terrace immediately to the east. In this context whilst the CA has some larger 3 storey buildings, including some buildings of note/importance i.e. Chorcliffe House, I do not feel this provides a template for new 3 storey buildings.

Having considered the previous schemes and the current proposal I find the increased scale of this apartment building will result in an imposing new building and one which does not represent a positive attribute/characteristic of the CA. The considerable height difference between this ¾ storey building and the adjacent brick terrace will be marked. This is evidenced in the streetview sections which show the new building being set at a higher level and being a considerably higher than the terrace to the side. Given the general large scale of the building and its single mass form I find that the building will be overly prominent within the CA and rather than providing an opportunity for improving the current vacant site, I feel the scheme will result in harm to the appearance of the CA. This prominence of the new building is made worse by the fact that the site/new building is to be set higher than road level (approx. 0.7 – 1.3m) which raises the building further above those existing 2 storey properties adjacent.

Mindful of the current poor state of the site I feel the scheme would represent a low level of harm and will fall at the lower end of the less than substantial category as defined by P.202 of the NPPF. The harm could be diminished by simply reducing the scale of the building and presenting a more representative 2 storey form/building height. It seems the fall-back situation for the LPA is the more suitable residential scheme presented and approved under application 19/00909. I have no information before me to show that scheme is not a viable one.

The NPPF requires LPA’s to consider the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets. Whilst any harm caused to heritage assets is regrettable this must be balanced by the overall benefits being achieved by the scheme. Paragraph 202 of the NPPF allows LPA’s to consider the harm caused to a heritage asset (in this instance St Laurence’s Conservation Area) and to weigh this against any public benefits generated by the proposal. More information on public benefits is included in the Planning Practice Guidance and can be anything that delivers economic, social or environmental objectives as described in the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 8).

In undertaking that weighted balancing exercise the LPA must give great weight (NPPF P.199) to any harm to a designated heritage asset in its planning balance.

Conclusion

As I am required to do so, I have given the duty imposed by s.72 of the P(LBCA) Act 1990 considerable weight in my comments.

I consider that the proposed scheme would not meet the statutory test 'to preserve' and would cause harm (low level less than substantial harm) to the appearance of the St Laurence's CA. As such, the proposal does not meet the objectives of Chapter 16 of the NPPF and is therefore also at odds with Policy 16 of the Central Lancashire Core Strategy and Policies BNE1(e) and BNE8 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026.

If in undertaking that weighted balance the LPA consider the benefits generated by the scheme outweigh the less than substantial harm to the conservation area then I would recommend that suitable Conditions are applied to permission requiring full details of facing materials to be agreed and that further details are provided re the methodology for the retention of the existing stone wall which front Water Street."

25. Taking the above comments into account, it is clear that the proposal would be harmful to the appearance of the St Laurence's Conservation Area. This harm is of a low level and less than substantial scale but must be given great weight in the planning balance. The proposal therefore conflicts with the aforementioned policies that seek to sustain, conserve and, where appropriate, enhance the significance, appearance, character and setting of the historic environment.
26. The Local Planning Authority must therefore consider the wider public benefits of the proposal against the level of harm to the significance of the heritage asset affected in its planning balance. The site has laid vacant for approximately 20 years and is now overgrown offering no positive contribution to the Conservation Area. It is considered that significant weight should be attributed to its redevelopment. The proposed build would also deliver social and economic benefits from construction work, whilst the delivery of new housing at a time when the Council has a housing shortfall is a significant benefit. The scheme would also create natural surveillance in an area of the town which can suffer from anti-social behaviour, and would help to act as a deterrent.
27. On balance it is considered that the benefits of the proposal outweigh the harm caused to the Conservation Area.

Impact on character and appearance of locality

28. Policy 17 of the Core Strategy seeks to ensure that the design of new buildings takes into account the character and appearance of the local area, including among other things, linking in with surrounding movement patterns and not prejudicing the development of neighbouring land; and protecting existing landscape features and natural assets.
29. Policy BNE1 (Design Criteria for New Development) of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 -2026 stipulates that planning permission will be granted for new development, including extensions, conversions and free standing structures, provided that, among other things, the proposal does not have a significantly detrimental impact on the surrounding area by virtue of its density, siting, layout, building to plot ratio, height, scale and massing, design, orientation and use of materials; that the layout, design and landscaping of all elements of the proposal, including any internal roads, car parking, footpaths and open spaces, are of a high quality and respect the character of the site and local area; and that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on important natural habitats and landscape features such as historic landscapes, mature trees, hedgerows, ponds and watercourses. In some circumstances where on balance it is considered acceptable to remove one or more of these features, then mitigation measures to replace the feature/s will be required either on or off-site.
30. When considering any development proposal, the Council must be mindful of The Framework that states that the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment and good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. The Framework also states that planning policies and decisions should aim to ensure that

developments (amongst other things) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development.

31. Chorley Council plans positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all development, including individual buildings, public and private spaces and wider area development schemes and seeks to create well-mixed and integrated developments, which avoid segregation and have well-planned public spaces that bring people together and provide opportunities for physical activity and recreation.
32. The topography of the site with the substantial change in levels to the rear allows the building to be seen in the context of the backdrop of a green banking with trees and buildings.
33. The form and visual grain of the immediate surroundings varies but to the west of the site there is a row of 8 No. bay fronted terraced houses (red smooth brick and grey slate roof) and then Lingmell House a 3-storey office block beyond (red facing brick with grey concrete tile roof). Opposite the site there are predominantly semi-detached houses and bungalows with red multi facing brick with grey concrete tile roof.
34. The proposal clearly represents a visual change to the site and the surrounding area, given the previous building was removed some 20 years ago. It would be much taller than the nearest dwellings, however, this is not an uncommon scenario within town centres and is not necessarily harmful. In this instance it is considered that the presence of other similarly sized buildings in the vicinity means the situation already exists in the area and this softens the impact of introducing another building of similar scale. The final choice of materials can be agreed by planning condition.
35. It is not considered that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the locality. The development therefore complies with policy BNE1 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 - 2026.

Neighbour amenity

36. Policy BNE1 (Design Criteria for New Development) of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 -2026 stipulates that planning permission will be granted for new development, including extensions, conversions and free standing structures, provided that, where relevant to the development the proposal would not cause harm to any neighbouring property by virtue of overlooking, overshadowing, or by creating an overbearing impact; and that the proposal would not cause an unacceptable degree of noise disturbance to surrounding land uses.
37. With regards to noise, dust and other pollution during the construction period, these would be short in duration and limited in intensity. Such impacts could be adequately controlled through the requirement to comply with the Council's Code of Practice for Construction and Demolition. This can be required through the imposition of a planning condition.
38. The residential uses in proximity to the application site are on the same side of Water Street as the application site, to the south and on the opposite side of the street, to the south. The orientation and separation distance of the buildings to the proposed building means there would be no harm to residential amenity as a result of the proposal through loss of privacy, overshadowing or overbearing.
39. In light of the above, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in terms of amenity impacts and accords with national policy and policy BNE1 of the Chorley Local Plan in this regard.

Highway safety

40. Policy BNE1 (Design Criteria for New Development) of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 -2026 stipulates that planning permission will be granted for new development, including extensions, conversions and free standing structures, provided that the residual cumulative highways impact of the development is not severe and it would not prejudice highway safety, pedestrian safety, the free flow of traffic, and would not reduce the number of on-site

parking spaces to below the standards stated in Site Allocations Policy – Parking Standards, unless there are other material considerations which justify the reduction.

41. Policy ST1 (New provision of Footpaths, Cycleways, Bridleways and their associated facilities in existing networks and new development) stipulates that new development and highways and traffic management schemes will not be permitted unless they include appropriate facilities for pedestrian, cycle parking facilities, and /or cycle routes. The policy requires, among other things, that proposal should provide for facilities for pedestrians and cyclists to facilitate access on foot and by bicycle to nearby residential, commercial, retail, educational and leisure areas, where appropriate; and additional footpaths, bridleways and cycleway routes between the countryside and built up areas where appropriate.
42. Policy ST4 of the Local Plan 2012-2016 sets out the Council's parking standards. Apartments require two spaces for two-bed apartments, which would ordinarily require 40 spaces. Policy ST4 however indicates that a lower level of provision is acceptable in sustainable locations, close to amenities and/or public transport links. The applications site is located in the town centre and so the proposed 20 spaces is acceptable in this instance. LCC Highways Services agree with this conclusion and have also requested two secure cycle storage spaces per apartment.
43. Lancashire County Council is the Local Highway Authority that manages and maintains the highway network in Lancashire and promotes safe travel and developments in accessible and sustainable locations within the county. As such, at certain stages in the planning process Chorley Council formally seeks the views of the County Council as a statutory consultee to assist in making an informed decision about proposed development.
44. As explained earlier in this report, LCC Highway Services requested amendments to the scheme during the consideration period which were subsequently reflected in revised plans submitted by the applicant. That is, all except the request that the applicant contributes towards a bicycle wheel ramp on the steps to the east of the site. The steps are part of the PROW and are Footpath 29. This was however not considered appropriate by the case officer as it would result in harm to the heritage value of the steps.
45. The proposal site would offer a choice of transport options. For those who wish to walk or cycle to the amenities in the town centre or other locations, this would be achievable. The occupants would not be car dependent. There would also be sufficient parking for those wishing to drive.
46. The applicant would be expected to enter into a S278 agreement to secure the reinstatement for the formation of the car park accesses, reinstatement of existing vehicle access and the removal of the bus stop marking and poles.
47. In light of the above, on balance, it is considered that the highway safety and parking related aspects of the proposal are acceptable and comply with the aforementioned policies.

Drainage and flood risk

48. Policy 29 (Water Management) of the Core Strategy seeks to improve water quality, water management and reduces the risk of flooding in a number of ways including, among other things, appraising, managing and reducing flood risk in all new developments. The policy is considered to be consistent with the Framework and should be attributed full weight.
49. The site is in Flood Zone 1 (the lowest risk) as identified by the Environment Agency. Site drainage plans have been submitted in support of the planning application that identifies that surface water would be drained into the existing culverted watercourse beneath Water Street at a reduced rate via oversized attenuation pipes and hydrobrake. This will require separate land drainage consent from the Lead Local Flood Authority and a permit from the Environment Agency. Foul water would drain to an existing sewer.

50. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SuDS) approach. Generally, the aim should be to discharge surface run off as high up the following hierarchy of drainage options as reasonably practicable:
- into the ground (infiltration);
 - to a surface water body;
 - to a surface water sewer, highway drain, or another drainage system;
 - to a combined sewer.
51. Following the receipt of additional information in the form of an updated drainage plan and associated surface water attenuation calculations, the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) have responded with no objections to the proposal, subject to conditions. United Utilities have no objection to the proposal.
52. The submitted drainage strategy identifies that ground infiltration would be unlikely to be feasible due to the underlying geology of the site. That said, the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) have requested that further investigation is required by the applicant to meet the requirements of planning conditions before any development commences at the site.
53. The conditions requested by the LLFA require, amongst other things, the full details of the surface water drainage strategy to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval and to be subsequently implemented. As such, the proposal is considered to be acceptable with regards to drainage and flood risk and complies with the aforementioned related policies.

Impact on ecological interests

54. Policy BNE9 (Biodiversity and Nature Conservation) of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026 stipulates that Biodiversity and Ecological Network resources will be protected, conserved, restored and enhanced; and that priority will be given to, among other things, protecting, safeguarding and enhancing habitats for European, nationally and locally important species. The policy also requires, among other things, that where there is reason to suspect that there may be protected habitats/species on or close to a proposed development site, the developer will be expected to carry out all necessary surveys in the first instance; planning applications must then be accompanied by a survey assessing the presence of such habitats/species and, where appropriate, make provision for their needs.
55. The applicant has submitted an ecological assessment in support of the proposal which found invasive species, nesting bird habitats but no evidence of roosting bats at the site. The Council's ecological advisors have reviewed the submitted assessments and raise no objection to the proposal, subject to conditions to ensure the eradication of invasive species, the protection of nesting birds and the delivery of net gains in biodiversity.
56. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of its impacts upon ecological receptors, subject to conditions to safeguard protected species and the implementation of biodiversity enhancement measures. The proposal is considered to be acceptable with regards to potential impacts upon ecological receptors and complies with policy BNE9 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026.

Impact on trees

57. Policy BNE10 (Trees) stipulates, among other things, that proposals that would result in the loss of trees, woodland areas or hedgerows which make a valuable contribution to the character of the landscape, a building, a settlement or the setting thereof will not be permitted. Replacement planting will be required where it is considered that the benefit of the development outweighs the loss of some trees or hedgerows.
58. A Tree Survey accompanies the application. The Council's tree officer has identified that the proposal would see the majority of the trees along the front edge of the site, adjacent Water Street, removed, while the majority of the trees in the back half of the site, adjacent The Old Manse, Park street, would be retained. None of the trees to be removed are of

particular importance individually, though collectively they offer a fairly high level of visual amenity. Should the development go ahead, replanting should take place to replace the amenity in the long term. Trees to be retained would be required to be protected during site works and this can be controlled by planning condition. A landscaping plan would also be required by condition to compensate for the loss of trees. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in this regard and complies with the above policy.

Land stability / Coal mining legacy

59. The application site is located within a Development High Risk Area for historic coal mining. Paragraphs 183 and 184 of the Framework require applicants to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the LPA that the application site is safe, stable and suitable for development.
60. Policy 17 of the Central Lancashire Core Strategy requires that proposals ensure that contaminated land, land stability and other risks associated with coal mining are considered and, where necessary, addressed through appropriate remediation and mitigation measures.
61. Policy BNE7 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026 seeks to ensure that development on unstable or potentially unstable land is fully investigated and remediated where necessary to ensure it is safe for developing.
62. The applicant has submitted a Coal Mining Risk Assessment which is based upon a Coal mining Report produced by the Coal Authority. The Report concludes that has concluded that the risk associated with coal mining related issues cannot be ruled out based on information from the Coal Authority and geological interpretation.
63. The principal risks to the development arise from:
 - the presence of a recorded mine shaft present within the site boundary;
 - mine gas
 - unrecorded mine entries;
64. It is therefore recommended that further intrusive ground investigations are undertaken. These might include rotary drilling to determine the location of the shaft, superficial thickness and depth of the base of the shaft. If found, it is recommended that the mineshaft is stabilised by drilling and grouting and capped to a current recommended specification.
65. The Coal Authority has no objection to the proposal, subject to conditions to secure further investigations and validate any remediation measures undertaken. It is considered that the proposal complies with the aforementioned paragraphs of the Framework and policy BNE7 of the Local Plan and policy 17 of the Core Strategy with regards to site stability. Issues relating to contaminated land are addressed below.

Affordable housing

66. The Framework requires that affordable housing should only be sought for residential developments that are major developments (in this context, the Framework defines major development as development where 10 or more homes will be provided, or the site has an area of 0.5 hectares or more).
67. An affordable housing contribution of 30% would normally therefore be required in accordance with Core Strategy Policy 7 and the Framework as part of this proposal. This equates to 6 affordable dwellings or a financial contribution of £216,264.
68. The applicant submitted a Viability Appraisal in support of the application which seeks to demonstrate that the development of the site is not viable if the affordable housing requirement is imposed by the Council in full.
69. Viability is a material planning consideration. Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states:

“Where up-to-date policies have set out the contributions expected from

development, planning applications that comply with them should be assumed to be viable. It is up to the applicant to demonstrate whether particular circumstances justify the need for a viability assessment at the application stage. The weight to be given to a viability assessment is a matter for the decision maker, having regard to all the circumstances in the case, including whether the plan and the viability evidence underpinning it is up to date, and any change in site circumstances since the plan was brought into force. All viability assessments, including any undertaken at the plan-making stage, should reflect the recommended approach in national planning guidance, including standardised inputs, and should be made publicly available.”

70. It has been agreed that the scheme can deliver £100,000 of total contributions, to include the Public open Space contribution detailed below. The agreed commuted sum therefore for borough-wide affordable housing provision required from this proposal is £51,340 which would be secured via a S106 legal agreement.

Public open space (POS)

71. Policy HS4 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026 requires public open space contributions for new dwellings to be provided in order to overcome the harm of developments being implemented without facilities being provided.

Amenity Greenspace

72. Local Plan Policy HS4A sets a standard of 0.73 hectares per 1,000 population. There is currently a deficit of provision in Chorley North East in relation to this standard, a contribution towards new provision in the ward is therefore required from this development. As the development is 10 or more dwellings the required amenity greenspace should be provided on-site. The amount required is 0.03504 hectares. A maintenance cost of £14,000 is also required for a 10-year period if private maintenance is not proposed.

Provision for children/young people

73. Local Plan Policy HS4A sets a standard of 0.08 hectares per 1,000 population. There is currently level provision in Chorley North West in relation to this standard, a contribution towards new provision in the ward is therefore required from this development – towards extended provision/providing additional equipment at site ref 1435 Astley Park playground. The amount required is £134 per dwelling.

Parks and Gardens

74. There is no requirement to provide a new park or garden on-site within this development. There are no parks/gardens within the accessibility catchment (1,000m) of this site identified as being low quality and/or low value in the Open Space Study therefore a contribution towards improving existing provision is not required.

Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace

75. There is no requirement to provide new natural/semi natural greenspace on-site within this development. There are no areas of natural/semi-natural greenspace within the accessibility catchment (800m) of this site identified as being low quality and/or low value in the Open Space Study therefore a contribution towards improving existing provision is not required.

Allotments

76. There is no requirement to provide allotment provision on site within this development. The site is not within the accessibility catchment (10 minutes' drive time) of a proposed new allotment site, a contribution towards new allotment provision is therefore not required from this development.

Playing Pitches

77. A Playing Pitch Strategy was published in June 2012 which identifies a Borough wide deficit of playing pitches but states that the majority of this deficit can be met by improving existing pitches. A financial contribution towards the improvement of existing playing pitches is therefore required from this development. The Playing Pitch Strategy includes an Action

Plan which identifies sites that need improvements. The amount required is £1,599 per dwelling.

Total contribution proposed

Amenity greenspace	= £14,000 (if private maintenance is not proposed)
Equipped play area	= £2,680
Parks/Gardens	= £0
Natural/semi-natural	= £0
Allotments	= £0
Playing Pitches	= £31,980
Total	= £48,660

Employment skills provision

78. The Central Lancashire Employment Skills Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was adopted in September 2017. The SPD introduces Employment Skills Statements and provides clarity as to how this requirement relates to the relevant policies set out in the Core Strategy and Local Plan as well as the guidance set out in the Framework. The SPD goes on to state that one of Central Lancashire's priorities is to encourage economic growth within Central Lancashire that benefits the people and businesses in the three boroughs.
79. It is, therefore, recommended that a condition requiring an employment and skills plan is attached to any grant of planning permission.

Community Infrastructure Levy

49. The Chorley CIL Infrastructure Charging Schedule provides a specific amount for development. The CIL Charging Schedule was adopted on 16 July 2013 and charging commenced on 1 September 2013. The proposed development would be a chargeable development and the charge is subject to indexation in accordance with the Council's Charging Schedule.

CONCLUSION

50. The decision is finely balanced as the proposal would be harmful to the appearance of the St Laurence's Conservation Area. On balance it is considered that the wider public benefits of the proposal in the form of delivering a much needed form of housing accommodation in a sustainable location on a brownfield site and its associated social and economic impacts, outweigh the harm caused by the proposal.
51. The proposal accords with the aims of policies within the Framework and the Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026 that seek to achieve sustainable development. It is also considered that the proposed development would not give rise to undue harm to the amenities of neighbouring residents, highway safety or flood risk and would not pose a risk from land instability and is accordingly recommended for approval.

RELEVANT HISTORY OF THE SITE

- Ref:** 5/1/01713 **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 3 January 1962
Description: Erection of small factory for the manufacture of clothing and offices adjoining.
- Ref:** 76/00093/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 26 April 1976
Description: Extension to Clothing Factory
- Ref:** 82/00541/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 14 September 1982
Description: Change of use of industrial premises to Church
- Ref:** 84/00201/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 1 May 1984
Description: New front facade

Ref: 07/00770/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 5 September 2007
Description: Construction of new offices/resource centre.

Ref: 18/00946/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 10 April 2019
Description: Construction of two storey office building and associated car park

Ref: 19/00909/OUTMAJ **Decision:** PEROPP **Decision Date:** 17 January 2020
Description: Outline application for the erection of 8no. dwellings with associated parking (with all matters reserved save for access)

RELEVANT POLICIES: In accordance with s.38 (6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004), the application is to be determined in accordance with the development plan (the Central Lancashire Core Strategy, the Adopted Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026 and adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance), unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Consideration of the proposal has had regard to guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the development plan. The specific policies/guidance considerations are contained within the body of the report.

Suggested conditions

1. The proposed development must be begun not later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

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

Title	Plan Ref	Received On
Location Plan	20-021-L01	22 December 2020
Proposed Floor Plans	20-021-P02	22 December 2020
Proposed Elevations & Section	20-021-P03	22 December 2020
Proposed Street Scenes	20/021/S01	22 December 2020
Proposed Site Plan	20/021/P01 Rev B	11 January 2023
Proposed Site Plan	20/021/P01 Rev B	23 March 2023

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

3. Before the development hereby permitted is first commenced, excluding site preparatory work, full details of existing and proposed ground levels and proposed building finished floor levels (all relative to ground levels adjoining the site) shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, notwithstanding any such detail shown on previously submitted plan(s). The development shall be carried out strictly in conformity with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the appearance of the locality and in the interests of the amenities of local residents.

4. No excavation works on the application site, including any required for clearance/demolition or site preparation shall take place until the applicant, or their agent or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological works, to include a formal watching brief to the standards and guidance set out by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists as an integral part of the groundworks required for the development. This watching brief must be carried out by an appropriately qualified and experienced professional contractor and in accordance with a written scheme of investigation, which shall first have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall include a contingency plan for the unexpected discovery of significant remains.

Reason: To ensure and safeguard the recording and inspection of matters of archaeological/historical importance associated with the site.

5. No works to trees or shrubs shall occur or external building works commence between the 1st March and 31st August in any year unless a detailed bird nest survey by a suitably experienced ecologist has been carried out immediately prior to clearance and written confirmation provided that no active bird nests are present which has been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: Wild birds and their eggs are protected under Part 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, which makes it illegal to kill or injure a bird and destroy its eggs or its nest whilst it is in use of being built.

6. Prior to any works taking place above DPC level, excluding demolition, a scheme for the landscaping of the development and its surroundings shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include all existing trees and hedgerows on the land; detail any to be retained, indicate the types and numbers of trees and shrubs to be planted, their distribution on site, those areas to be seeded, paved or hard landscaped; and detail any changes of ground level or landform, proposed finished levels, means of enclosure, minor artefacts and structures. The scheme should include a landscaping/habitat creation and management plan which should aim to contribute to targets specified in the UK and Lancashire Biodiversity Action Plans. Landscaping proposals should comprise only native plant communities appropriate to the natural area.

All hard and soft 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.

7. The Chorley Council document "Code of Practice for Construction and Demolition" shall be adhered to throughout the construction period.

Reason: To protect the amenities of the nearby residents.

8. The measures of tree protection specified in BS 5837:2012 shall be implemented throughout the approved works at the site.

Reason: To safeguard the trees to be retained.

9. The development shall not commence until an Employment and Skills Plan that is tailored to the development and will set out the employment skills opportunities for the construction phase of the development has been submitted to and approved by the council as Local Planning Authority (unless otherwise agreed in writing by the council). The development shall be carried out in accordance with the Employment and Skills Plan (in the interests of delivering local employment and skills training opportunities in accordance with Core Strategy Policy 15: Skills and Economic Inclusion).

Reason: In the interests of delivering local employment and skills training opportunities as per the Central Lancashire Core Strategy Policy 15: Skills and Economic Inclusion and the Central Lancashire Employment Skills Supplementary Planning Document September 2017. No Employment and Skills Plan was submitted with the application.

10. No part of the development hereby approved shall commence until a scheme for the construction of the site access and reinstatement of existing access has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.

Reason: To satisfy the Local Planning Authority and Highway Authority that the final details of the highway scheme/works are acceptable before work commences on site.

11. Before the access is used for vehicular purposes the visibility splays measuring 2.4 metres by 25 metres in both directions to be provided, measured along the centre line of the proposed new accesses from the continuation of the nearer edge of the existing carriageway of Water Street, to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. The land within these splays shall be maintained thereafter, free from obstructions such as walls, fences, trees, hedges, shrubs, ground growth or other structures within the splays in excess of 1.0 metre in height above the height at the centre line of the adjacent carriageway.

Reason: To ensure adequate visibility at the street junction or site access in the interest of highway safety.

12. The private car parking to be marked out in accordance with the approved plan, before occupation of the associated dwellings and permanently maintained thereafter.

Reason: To allow for the effective use of the parking areas.

13. The layout of the development shall include provisions to enable vehicles to enter and leave the highway in forward gear and such provisions shall be laid out in accordance with the approved plan and the vehicular turning space shall be laid out and be available for use before any development commences and a suitable turning area is to be maintained thereafter.

Reason: Vehicles reversing to and from the highway are a hazard to other road users, for residents and construction vehicles.

14. The car parking area and manoeuvring area the development shall be constructed in accordance with the Lancashire County Council Specification for Construction of Estate Roads to at least sub base before any development takes place within the site.

Reason: To ensure that provision is made for the storage of materials and contracting staff.

15. The cycling facilities to be provided in accordance with a scheme to be approved by the Local Planning Authority and the cycling facilities to be provided in accordance with the approved plan, before the use of the premises hereby permitted becomes operative and permanently maintained thereafter.

Reason: To allow for the effective use of the parking areas the promotion of sustainable forms of transport and aid social inclusion.

16. Prior to the commencement of development a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (in conjunction with the highway authority). The TMP shall include and specify the provisions to be made for the following -

- The parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- Loading and unloading of plant and materials used in the construction of the development;
- Storage of such plant and materials;
- Wheel washing facilities;
- Periods when plant and materials trips should not be made to and from the site (mainly peak hours but the developer to identify times when trips of this nature should not be made)
- Routes to be used by vehicles carrying plant and materials to and from the site;
- Measures to ensure that construction and delivery vehicles do not impede access to adjoining properties

Reason: To protect existing road users and to maintain the operation and safety of the local highway network and to minimise the impact of the construction works on the local highway network.

17. The development permitted by this planning permission shall be carried out in accordance with the principles set out within the surface water sustainable drainage strategy "DRAINAGE STRATEGY v2" uploaded to the planning website on 11/01/2023. The measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation of the development and in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme, or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory sustainable drainage facilities are provided to serve the site in accordance with the Paragraphs 167 and 169 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Planning Practice Guidance and Defra Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems.

18. No development shall commence in any phase until a detailed, final surface water sustainable drainage strategy for the site has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

The detailed surface water sustainable drainage strategy shall be based upon the site specific flood risk assessment and indicative surface water sustainable drainage strategy submitted and sustainable drainage principles and requirements set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, Planning Practice Guidance and Defra Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems. No surface water shall be allowed to discharge to the public foul sewer(s), directly or indirectly.

The details of the drainage strategy to be submitted for approval shall include, as a minimum;

- a) Sustainable drainage calculations for peak flow control and volume control for the:
 - i. 100% (1 in 1-year) annual exceedance probability event;
 - ii. 3.3% (1 in 30-year) annual exceedance probability event, with an allowance for urban creep;
 - iii. 1% (1 in 100-year) annual exceedance probability event + 40% climate change allowance, with an allowance for urban creep
- b) Final sustainable drainage plans appropriately labelled to include, as a minimum:
 - i. Site plan showing all permeable and impermeable areas that contribute to the drainage network either directly or indirectly, including surface water flows from outside the curtilage as necessary;
 - ii. Sustainable drainage system layout showing all pipe and structure references, dimensions and design levels; to include all existing and proposed surface water drainage systems up to and including the final outfall;
 - iii. Details of all sustainable drainage components, including landscape drawings showing topography and slope gradient as appropriate;
 - iv. Drainage plan showing flood water exceedance routes in accordance with Defra Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems;
 - v. Finished Floor Levels (FFL) in AOD with adjacent ground levels for all sides of each building and connecting cover levels to confirm minimum 150 mm+ difference for FFL;
 - vi. Details of proposals to collect and mitigate surface water runoff from the development boundary;
 - vii. Measures taken to manage the quality of the surface water runoff to prevent pollution, protect groundwater and surface waters, and delivers suitably clean water to sustainable drainage components to prevent blockage;
- c) Evidence of an assessment of the site conditions to include site investigation and test results to confirm infiltrations rates and groundwater levels in accordance with BRE 365.
- d) Evidence of an assessment of the existing on-site culverted watercourse to be used, to confirm that these systems are in sufficient condition and have sufficient capacity to accept surface water runoff generated from the development.
- e) Evidence that a free-flowing outfall can be achieved. If this is not possible, evidence of a surcharged outfall applied to the sustainable drainage calculations will be required.

The sustainable drainage strategy shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory sustainable drainage facilities are provided to serve the site in accordance with the Paragraphs 167 and 169 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Planning Practice Guidance and Defra Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems.

19. No development shall commence until a Construction Surface Water Management Plan, detailing how surface water and stormwater will be managed on the site during construction, including demolition and site clearance operations, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The details of the plan to be submitted for approval shall include for each phase, as a minimum:

- a) Measures taken to ensure surface water flows are retained on-site during the construction phase(s), including temporary drainage systems, and, if surface water flows are to be discharged, they are done so at a restricted rate that must not exceed the equivalent runoff rate from the site prior to redevelopment.
- b) Measures taken to prevent siltation and pollutants from the site into any receiving groundwater and/or surface waters, including watercourses, with reference to published guidance.

The plan shall be implemented and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved plan for the duration of construction.

Reason: To ensure the development is served by satisfactory arrangements for the disposal of surface water during each construction phase(s) so it does not pose an undue surface water flood risk on-site or elsewhere during any construction phase in accordance with Paragraph 167 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

20. The occupation of the development shall not be permitted until a site-specific Operation and Maintenance Manual for the lifetime of the development, pertaining to the surface water drainage system and prepared by a suitably competent person, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The details of the manual to be submitted for approval shall include, as a minimum:

- a) A timetable for its implementation;
- b) Details of the maintenance, operational and access requirement for all SuDS components and connecting drainage structures, including all watercourses and their ownership)
- c) Pro-forma to allow the recording of each inspection and maintenance activity, as well as allowing any faults to be recorded and actions taken to rectify issues;
- d) The arrangements for adoption by any public body or statutory undertaker, or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the sustainable drainage scheme in perpetuity;
- e) Details of financial management including arrangements for the replacement of major components at the end of the manufacturer's recommended design life;
- f) Details of whom to contact if pollution is seen in the system or if it is not working correctly; and
- g) Means of access for maintenance and easements.

Thereafter the drainage system shall be retained, managed, and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that surface water flood risks from development to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those risks to controlled waters, property, and ecological systems, and to ensure that the sustainable drainage system is subsequently maintained pursuant to the requirements of Paragraph 169 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

21. The occupation of the development shall not be permitted until a site-specific verification report, pertaining to the surface water sustainable drainage system, and prepared by a suitably competent person, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The verification report must, as a minimum, demonstrate that the surface water sustainable drainage system has been constructed in accordance with the approved drawing(s) (or detail

any minor variations) and is fit for purpose. The report shall contain information and evidence, including photographs, of details and locations (including national grid references) of critical drainage infrastructure (including inlets, outlets, and control structures) and full as-built drawings. The scheme shall thereafter be maintained in perpetuity.

Reason: To ensure that surface water flood risks from development to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those risks to controlled waters, property, and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development as constructed is compliant with the requirements of Paragraphs 167 and 169 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

22. During the full period of construction, facilities shall be provided within the site by which means the wheels of vehicles may be cleaned before leaving the site. The roads adjacent to the site shall be mechanically swept as required during the full construction period.

Reason: To avoid the possibility of the public highway being affected by the deposit of mud and/or loose materials thus creating a potential hazard to road users.

23. No development shall commence until;

- a) a scheme of intrusive site investigations has been carried out on site to establish the risks posed to the development by the on-site mine entry (CA shaft ref: 358417-008), and;
- b) any remediation works and/or mitigation measures to address land instability arising from coal mining legacy, as may be necessary, have been implemented on site in full in order to ensure that the site is made safe and stable for the development proposed. This should include the submission of the approved site layout plan that illustrates the exact location and calculated zone of influence of the mine entry in order that the area at risk in the event of a catastrophic failure of the mine entry can be seen, and which highlights areas where mitigation measures are likely to be required.

The intrusive site investigations and remedial works shall be carried out in accordance with authoritative UK guidance.

Reason: The undertaking of intrusive site investigations, prior to the commencement of development, is considered to be necessary to ensure that adequate information pertaining to ground conditions and coal mining legacy is available to enable appropriate remedial and mitigatory measures to be identified and carried out before building works commence on site. This is in order to ensure the safety and stability of the development, in accordance with paragraphs 178 and 179 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

24. Prior to the occupation of the development, or it being taken into beneficial use, a signed statement or declaration prepared by a suitably competent person confirming that the site is, or has been made, safe and stable for the approved development shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. This document shall confirm the methods and findings of the intrusive site investigations and the completion of any remedial works and/or mitigation necessary to address the risks posed by past coal mining activity.

Reason: To ensure the development is safe for occupation.

25. Prior to the commencement of development (including demolition, ground works, vegetation clearance), an invasive non-native species protocol shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority, detailing the containment, control and removal of Japanese Knotweed, cotoneaster and montbretia on site. The measures shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To avoid the spread of an invasive species.

26. A scheme for the Biodiversity Compensation and Enhancement Measures, as set out in section 5 of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal by Bowland Ecology dated December 2020, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to first occupation of the development (or in accordance with


a phasing plan which shall first be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure biodiversity mitigation is delivered.


27. Prior to their installation, images and specifications of all external facing and roofing materials (notwithstanding any details shown on previously submitted plan(s) and specification) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All works shall be undertaken strictly in accordance with the details as approved.

Reason: To ensure that the materials used are visually appropriate to the locality.

This page is intentionally left blank



0m 125m



Revision Notes:

Scale: 1:1250



CLIENT
Gradus Homes Ltd.

PROJECT NAME
Proposed Residential Development on the site of the

Former Mormon Church, Water Street, Chorley, PR7 1EE

DRAWING NAME
Location Plan

SCALE	DRAWN BY	DATE	DRAWING NUMBER	REVISION
1:1250 @ A4	ASL	11/05/20	20-021-L01	-

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Committee Meeting

12 September 2023




Item 3a

20/01378/FULMAJ

Formerly Mormon Church, Water Street, Chorley

Erection of three storey apartment block comprising of 20 no. apartments, including vehicular access to Water Street and associated parking

Location plan



Proposed Site Layout



Proposed Elevations



FRONT ELEVATION

Red clay ridge tiles
 White grey concrete roof tiles
 Light finished and unpainted
 Black window half round for green light windows
 Stone steps and sills
 Red brick base course
 All work to be done
 Stone masonry to the porch




REAR ELEVATION



SIDE ELEVATION (L)







SIDE ELEVATION (R)




MID-SECTION

Proposed Floor Plans



Proposed Cross Sections



Proposed Drainage Plan



Site photograph



Site photograph



Site photograph – dwellings opposite



Site photograph – steps entrance to north east and site frontage



Site photograph – facing into site from footway on Water Street



Site photograph



Site photograph facing south



Site photograph facing north



Site photograph



Site photograph – dwellings to the south west



This page is intentionally left blank

ITEM 3a - 20/01378/FULMAJ – Formerly Mormon Church, Water Street, Chorley

The recommendation remains as per the original report

(3)No. further letters of objection have been received setting out the following issues:

- Development would exacerbate current drainage issues.
- The land is unstable and unsuitable to develop
- Ecological impacts
- Amenity impacts
- Health and well being impacts

This page is intentionally left blank

APPLICATION REPORT – 23/00616/PIP**Validation Date: 4 August 2023****Ward: Croston, Mawdesley And Euxton South****Type of Application: Permission In Principle****Proposal: Permission in principle application for up to 9 new build older persons accessible bungalow dwellings.****Location: Whitegates 75 Gorsey Lane Mawdesley Ormskirk L40 3TE****Case Officer: Daniel Power****Applicant: Mr Paul Bennet****Agent: Mr Martin Boardman MWB Architecture****Consultation expiry: 28 August 2023****Decision due by: 8 September 2023**

RECOMMENDATION

1. It is recommended that permission in principle is refused for the following reason:

The proposed development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and, therefore, harmful by definition. There would also be other harm as a result of sprawl and encroachment. It is not considered that there are very special circumstances to overcome the definitional harm to the Green Belt and additional harm caused through sprawl and encroachment. The proposal is, therefore, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework.

SITE DESCRIPTION

2. The application site is located near Mawdesley, to the north of Gorsey Lane and to the rear of no. 75 Gorsey Lane. The site is located within the Green Belt with a small section of the southern boundary of the site, adjoining the Settlement Area of Mawdesley. To the south and west of the site there have been several planning permissions granted for a replacement dwelling and three new dwellings. Some of these permissions are currently under construction but have not yet been completed. The southern side of Gorsey Lane is characterised by detached bungalows within similarly sized plots. Further to the west within the village there are two storey dwellings, within larger plots.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

3. This application seeks permission in principle for a minimum of 8 no. dwellings and a maximum of 9 no. dwellings for older persons. Paragraph 012 of the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) on Permission in Principle, states that “the scope of permission in principle is limited to location, land use and amount of development. Issues relevant to these ‘in principle’ matters should be considered at the permission in principle stage. Other matters should be considered at the technical details consent stage. In addition, local authorities cannot list the information they require for

applications for permission in principle in the same way they can for applications for planning permission.”

4. The permission in principle process came into force on 15 April 2017 with the government intention of simplifying the planning process for developers, and to give developers more certainty over whether a site is suitable for development ahead of going to the expense of working up more detailed proposals necessary to obtain full planning permission. The government expected this to encourage new development and increase the amount of land available to build on, thereby helping to boost housing supply. Whilst the Council has been clear that it prefers a locally-led planning process, as the local planning authority, the current NPPG must be followed.

REPRESENTATIONS

5. Two letters of objection have been received and can be summarised as follows:
 - The development on Green Belt will further reduce the supply of this within the village.
 - Impact adversely upon the traffic volume and highway safety within Gorsey Lane
 - Could add to existing surface water issues.
 - There is already insufficient sewage capacity within the area.
6. Two letters of support have been received supporting the principle of adaptable houses for older people, as this would allow for down sizing and for older people to stay in the area. There is a perceived shortage of such properties in Mawdesley.

CONSULTATIONS

7. Lancashire County Council Highway Services: Are of the opinion that the proposed permission in principle application for up to 9 new build older persons accessible bungalow dwellings would have a detrimental impact on highway safety in the immediate vicinity of the site and should be refused on highway safety issues.
8. Greater Manchester Ecology Unit: No comments have been received.
9. United Utilities: General advice provided and conditions recommended.
10. Mawdesley Parish Council: No comments have been received.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Principle of the development in the Green Belt

11. The application site is located wholly within the Green Belt, and is a greenfield site falling outside of the settlement boundary of Mawdesley. National guidance on Green Belt is contained in Chapter 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which states:

The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.
12. The Framework states that the Green Belt serves five purposes: a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
13. Paragraph 147 of the Framework states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special

circumstances. Paragraph 149 states that *local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:*

- a) buildings for agriculture and forestry;*
- b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;*
- c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;*
- d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;*
- e) limited infilling in villages;*
- f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and*
- g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:*
 - not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or*
 - not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.*

14. The application is not proposed for agricultural purposes and does not propose the provision for outdoor sports or cemeteries. The application site is currently devoid of any built form or buildings, therefore does not seek to extend or replace an existing building. With regards to 'limited infilling', the north east and south east of the application site are vacant of any built form, with two dwellings to the south west and a large outbuilding to the north west. There is no definition of 'village' or 'limited infilling' within the NPPF or other local or relevant planning policy. The site is adjacent to the settlement boundary of Mawdesley with recent applications permitted to the south considered as being within the 'village. There have been several planning appeals that have generally accepted the definition of infilling is the infilling of a small gap in an otherwise built up frontage. The site would not be within an otherwise built up frontage, and would further extend the settlement, rather than 'infilling' an existing frontage. For these reasons outlined above, it is not considered the proposal would engage with any of the exceptions to inappropriate development set out within paragraph 149 of the Framework.
15. Substantial weight should be attached to the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness as set out at paragraph 148 of the Framework. As the proposal is considered to be inappropriate development the tests of paragraph 148 of the Framework are engaged. This sets out that very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. The proposal must be considered in its entirety in order to properly consider the harms, benefits and other considerations in the Green Belt balance.
16. As already established there is harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, to which substantial weight is attached. The harm to the purposes of the Green Belt are set out below in relation to paragraph 138 of the Framework, which identifies five purposes of the Green Belt.
17. Purpose 1: Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas. The proposed development would depart from the linear form of development in this location spreading north. Any resultant development of the application site would therefore contribute to an element of sprawl from the built up area of Mawdesley into open countryside. As such there would be some conflict with this purpose and therefore an element of harm.

18. Purpose 2: Prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another. Development of the site would not lead to the coalescence of neighbouring villages. The site is located close to the settlement area boundary of Mawdesley, which lies to the west, though any further settlements to the east are located some distance away and the proposed development would not therefore connect or merge settlements. It is, therefore, considered that the proposed development would not have a significant impact on the merging of neighbouring towns.
19. Purpose 3: Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The site comprises undeveloped grassland. This would be encroached upon by buildings, roads and hard surfacing with garden curtilages established, within which development may take place. As a result there would be clear encroachment into the countryside and therefore conflict with this purpose of the Green Belt, resulting in some harm.
20. Purpose 4: Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. This does not apply as the site is not located near a historical town.
21. Purpose 5: Assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. There is a need for housing within the borough and currently it has been established that there is an undersupply. The local plan review is at an early stage, however, it is clear that there is limited scope to supply new housing through the recycling of derelict and other urban land due to the limited availability of sites on such land. It is, therefore, considered that the proposed development would not undermine this policy purpose.
22. On the basis of the above it is considered that there would be other harm to the Green Belt caused by the harm to purposes 1 and 3 of including land in the Green Belt, as the proposed development would make some contribution to the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas and would result in encroachment into the countryside.
23. As the proposed development would result in definitional harm to the Green Belt and other harm through the contribution to the unrestricted sprawl and encroachment there would have to be very special circumstances to justify the grant of planning permission that would outweigh this harm.

Very special circumstances

24. The Framework states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' (VSC) will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
25. The application seeks planning in principle for between 8 no and 9 no. elderly persons bungalows for people of age 55 and above, with associated access way, gardens, single garages, and enhanced biodiversity land with accessibility to the ponds, meadowland and the public footpath to the north. The application was submitted with a Planning Statement, which acknowledges that the proposal amounts to inappropriate development in the Green Belt as it falls outside of the exceptions to inappropriate development within the Framework. The Planning Statement makes the point that there is an identified need for older persons' housing, and will be greater in an area (Mawdesley) where the population already has a high proportion of aged households; and that currently the need is not being met. Furthermore, the Planning Statement outlines the opportunity, at technical details stage, to enhance open space and local biodiversity and access to both. The Statement concludes that these matters together amount to very special circumstances which in their view, outweighs the limited harm to the openness of the Green Belt.

26. In considering the benefits put forward in the supporting Planning Statement, enhancements of local biodiversity would be of some benefit, however, these are not quantified and no mechanism have been proposed by which they could be secured. As such no weight can be attached. The statement makes reference to enhanced open space, with the implication that this would be public open space. This is identified on the location plan and is considered to carry moderate weight as a social benefit.
27. The Planning Statement make reference to the Chorley Housing Needs Strategy 2022, which identifies a number of 'general trends which underpin the need for this type of accessible housing'. The applicants agent relies on this document, which in their view identified need for older persons' housing, which will be greater in an area (Mawdesley) where the population already has a high proportion of aged households; and that currently the need is not being met. In addition, the application makes reference to the judgement of Hunston Properties Ltd [2013] EWCA Civ 1610; [2014] JPL 599, Kay and Ryder LJJ. In that judgement, Sir David Keane determined that a housing shortfall could in itself amount to VSC.
28. Within the text of the above High Court decision, the judge comments that the crucial question was have VSCs been demonstrated to outweigh the Green Belt harm, by reason of the inappropriate development. Such circumstances are not automatically demonstrated simply because there is a less than a five year supply of housing land. The judgment also comments that there may be other factors as well, one of those is the planning context in which that shortfall is to be seen. The context may be that the district in question is subject on a considerable scale to policies protecting much or most of the undeveloped land from development except in exceptional or very special circumstances.
29. In consider the 5 year housing land supply, the latest Five Year Housing Supply Statement for Chorley (June 2022) states that as of 1st April 2022 there was a total supply of 1,890 (net) deliverable dwellings which is a 3.3 year deliverable housing supply over the period 2022 – 2027 based on the annual housing requirement of 569 dwellings which includes a 5% buffer. The proposal would make a small contribution to this shortage and contribute towards old persons hosing supply, and can be afforded significant weight. In additional there would be economic benefits for proposal although they would be modest and so can be afforded moderate weight.
30. With regard to the new Local Plan and meeting the five year housing supply. Chorley Council is working with Preston and South Ribble Councils to produce a Central Lancashire Local Plan (CLLP). Once adopted, this will replace the existing joint Core Strategy and Chorley Local Plan. The CLLP is at an early stage of preparation and consultation on Issues and Options closed in February 2020. The Central Lancashire Local Plan (CLLP) is at the Preferred Options Stage and public consultation on Preferred Options Part 1 closed in February 2023. The emerging CLLP will look at the distribution of new homes and the CLLP will be informed by an evidence base including a Housing Need and Demand Study, the results of which will also help to inform the future distribution of housing across the Plan area.
31. As detailed within this report, the application represents inappropriate development, which by definition is harmful to the Green Belt. The application proposes 8/9 dwellings and would therefore make a small contribution towards older persons' dwellings within the immediate area which would be a significant benefit. However, in the absence of an identified need for the release of a greenfield Green Belt site, the substantial harm to the Green Belt is not clearly outweighed by the other material considerations either individually or as a whole. Therefore, the very special circumstances necessary to justify the inappropriate residential development in the Green Belt do not exist.

Other matters

32. Objections have been received relating to the impact to the local highway due to the volume of traffic and highway safety. In addition, objections have been received relating to surface water management and insufficient sewage capacity. These are technical matters that could only be assessed as part of any future application for technical details consent. They fall outside the scope of what the Council can assess as part of this current application, as set out in the above paragraph from the NPPG.

CONCLUSION

33. The proposed development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and, therefore, harmful by definition. There would also be other harm as a result of sprawl and encroachment. It is not considered that there are very special circumstances to overcome the definitional harm to the Green Belt and additional harm caused through sprawl and encroachment. The proposal is, therefore, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework.

RELEVANT HISTORY OF THE SITE

- Ref:** 08/00613/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 21 July 2008
Description: Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of a replacement dwelling
- Ref:** 08/00952/FUL **Decision:** REFFPP **Decision Date:** 24 October 2008
Description: Erection of a detached dwelling together with the formation of new access to Gorse Lane
- Ref:** 08/01132/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 2 January 2009
Description: Erection of a detached dwelling together with the formation of new access to Gorse Lane
- Ref:** 11/00504/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 28 July 2011
Description: Application to extend the time limit for implementation of planning permission 08/00613/FUL (Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of a replacement dwelling)
- Ref:** 11/00980/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 30 April 2012
Description: Erection of a detached dwelling together with the formation of new access to Gorse Lane (renewal of application 08/01132/FUL)
- Ref:** 14/00769/FUL **Decision:** WDN **Decision Date:** 10 November 2014
Description: Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of a replacement dwelling
- Ref:** 18/01212/OUT **Decision:** PEROPP **Decision Date:** 27 February 2019
Description: Outline application (specifying access, layout and scale) for erection of a two storey dwelling
- Ref:** 19/00726/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 15 November 2019
Description: Erection of a single dwelling following demolition of existing single dwelling
- Ref:** 20/00936/FUL **Decision:** REFFPP **Decision Date:** 9 December 2020
Description: Erection of 3no. detached dwellinghouses, including 2no. access points to Gorse Lane, following the demolition of the existing dwellinghouse
- Ref:** 21/00668/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 11 October 2021
Description: Demolition of existing house and erection of one replacement dwelling
- Ref:** 21/01434/REM **Decision:** PERRES **Decision Date:** 12 October 2022
Description: Reserved matters application pursuant to outline planning permission 18/01212/OUT (Outline application (specifying access, layout and scale) for erection of a two

storey dwelling) seeking approval of details of appearance, landscaping and surface water drainage (condition no.3)

Ref: 22/00051/DIS

Decision: PEDISZ

Decision Date: 14 March 2022

Description: Application to discharge conditions nos. 5 (external facing and roofing materials), 6 (landscaping scheme), 7 (levels), 9 (dwelling emission rate) of planning permission ref: 21/00668/FUL (Demolition of existing house and erection of one replacement dwelling)

RELEVANT POLICIES: In accordance with s.38 (6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004), the application is to be determined in accordance with the development plan (the Central Lancashire Core Strategy, the Adopted Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026 and adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance), unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Consideration of the proposal has had regard to guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the development plan. The specific policies/ guidance considerations are contained within the body of the report.

This page is intentionally left blank

EXISTING SITE PLAN - PLANNING PERMISSIONS RECENTLY APPROVED

NOTES:
 This drawing is meant for design intent only.
 This drawing should not be scaled from.
 All dimension are to be checked and confirmed by the contractors prior to construction.
 mwbResidence accepts no responsibility for construction.

414500


414500

414400

414400

414300

414300



REV	DATE	NOTES
P01	26/06/2023	PLANNING IN PRINCIPLE



www.mwbresidence.com
 Office Number: 01704 634372

Project No: 318
 Client: Mr Paul Bennett
 Project Address:
 Whitegates, Gorsey Lane, Mawdesley

Drawing No: **20020**
 STATUS: PLANNING
 Date: 26/06/2023
 Drawing Title:
 Existing Site Plan
 Scale: 1:1250 @ A3
 Drawn: MB
 Checked: MBW
 Status: PP
 Revision: P01

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Committee Meeting

12 September 2023



Item 3b

23/00616/PIP

Whitegates, 75 Gorsey Lane, Mawdesley

Permission in principle application for up to 9 new build older persons accessible bungalow dwellings.

Location plan



Aerial photo



Application Site


Indicative Site Layout





Indicative Bungalow



PROPOSED FRONT ELEVATION



PROPOSED SIDE ELEVATION



PROPOSED REAR ELEVATION

FLOOR AREAS - BUNGALOW	
GROUND FLOOR	
78.28sqm	842.40sqft
TOTAL FLOOR AREA	
78.28 sqm	842.40 sqft
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DETACHED • 1 STOREY • 3 BEDROOM 	



PROPOSED SIDE ELEVATION

Site photograph



Site photograph



Site photograph



This page is intentionally left blank

ITEM 3b - 23/00616/PIP – Whitegates, 75 Gorsey Lane, Mawdesley**The recommendation remains as per the original report**

(1) No further letters neither objecting to or supporting the Planning Application have been received setting out the following issues:

- Highway safety concerns.
- The dwellings are not proposed as being “affordable”.
- There are apartments at Stocks Hall for those over 50, and they are still on the market, which could question need.
- Impact on privacy of nearby occupiers.

(8) No further letters of support have been received on the following basis:

- Much needed accommodation for downsizing.
- Meets a local need providing housing for older people.
- Would help to maintain the community.
- The land serves no purpose currently.
- The site is dilapidated.
- Development would have very little impact on highways and drainage.
- Health and well being benefits.
- The development would free up larger homes for families.
- There is a housing crisis and more houses are needed.
- The benefits outweigh the harm to the Green Belt

The following consultee responses have been received:

Mawdesley Parish Council submitted the following comments on 08 September 2023:

We have spent a lot of time considering our comments to this application, as initially if we just look at the 'headlines' - up to 9 new residences built on Greenbelt within a plot of about an acre, it would normally be a fairly open and shut case and an objection on the usual grounds for us.

However, given the quite specific nature of the proposal, I do think it deserves some further thought and we would urge the Planning Committee to consider the following points: Firstly, there is rarely a Parish Council meeting that goes by when we discuss planning matters when the comments made don't arise as to the continuing proliferation of 'executive homes' and yet another 4/5 bed property being built or extended from a smaller property.

We have also commented on many occasions that our ageing population would benefit from more smaller, and ideally single storey properties being built. Given this, we would also like to request a clause, as Agricultural Restriction, which states that these properties must remain as true bungalows.

This scheme therefore seems to fulfil a variety of needs - it provides the accommodation that we all believe would be popular with the age bracket in question, and in doing so, potentially frees up a number of larger houses which are currently occupied by older couples or single people whose families have now left home, creating opportunities for the younger, growing families of the village to access more appropriate accommodation.

On the matter of being in Greenbelt. If this development was in a location that had not seen any recent building and several applications approved in Greenbelt, then we would probably have a different opinion. However, within a section of less than 100 yards of Gorsey Lane,

there have been 6 approvals for properties - some claiming volume from other buildings, but 6 new residences nonetheless.

Add to this that the proposed bungalow development wouldn't actually have any road frontage (as it's behind two new houses fronting onto Gorse Lane - both recently approved in the same area of Greenbelt) and we have less to object to than the variety of much larger houses in exactly the same location that Chorley Council have already approved.

The National Planning Policy Framework defines inappropriate development in the Greenbelt as follows:

147. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

148. When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

The key factor that has been used in a number of recent applications (that we have actually objected to) such as the Robin Hood development and the two new properties at Mayfield on Bluestone Lane is whether the proposal causes harm to the Greenbelt, or indeed that the benefits of the development outweigh the potential 'harm'.

In those instances, it was found that there were 'very special circumstances' to allow the application to proceed, whereby the benefits outweighed the harm to Greenbelt. Many of our residents would dispute that contention in relation to the two aforementioned applications, but in this case, I do believe that there are genuine 'very special circumstances' which do outweigh the potential harm, particularly given that the very same half dozen acres or so has already had 6 properties approved for building upon in the last couple of years.

If this proposal was within the settlement area in the centre of the village, I know that the vast majority of residents would be massively in favour but sadly the land available within the settlement area has mostly already been earmarked by larger developers and we suspect that they won't be falling over themselves to build bungalows for our older generations.

However, having said all the above, we do also think that the density of the proposal is perhaps too high, and that slightly fewer properties would sit better within the proposed site.

There is also a potential issue with the access onto Gorse Lane. Whilst this has already been approved as suitable for the two houses at the front of the development, the additional traffic could cause an issue. We would therefore suggest a re-think of the access, perhaps to widen the splays and set the access slightly further back into the site, allowing for better vision for traffic both entering and leaving the site but also passing traffic in both directions.

Furthermore, we believe there is also great potential here to create a much more 'eco-friendly' development - the addition of rainwater harvesting to feed toilets for example, sedum roofs, permeable surfaces etc etc which could all be stipulated as a condition of development and in turn would offset any perceived harm to the Greenbelt.

We also understand that the applicant is minded to gift the remainder of the land behind the proposed development so that a wildlife/conservation area could be created. The history of that site also used to include a large attenuation pond, which was filled in when the land was razed some years ago. If this pond was reinstated, that would aid any potential drainage issues from surface water run off created by these new buildings as well as creating a nice environment and access to the public footpath network beyond that leads over to a Tarnbeck Drive and the village centre.

On balance, we would therefore support this application, subject to some revisions to the scale and trying to limit any issues created in relation to surface water drainage etc along with the reinstatement of the pond and the creation of a wildlife area.

Lancashire County Council Highways have made the following comments:

LCC Highways does not have any objections regarding the proposed permission in principle application for up to 9 new build older persons accessible bungalow dwellings and are of the opinion that the proposed development will not have a significant impact on highway safety, capacity or amenity in the immediate vicinity of the site.

The amended drawings show a radius kerbed access and 2m wide footway fronting the site. The internal layout of the site shows that the proposal including the two permitted developments can be to adoptable standards.

The original report has been amended as follows:

Paragraph 26 of the report refers to enhanced open space, which it is implied would become public open space. The report sets out that this is a benefit considered to carry moderate weight as a social benefit. It is noted, however, that the area of land implied as possible public open space lies outside the red edge application site and therefore no weight can be attributed to this as it would not be secured through any grant of permission in principle.

This page is intentionally left blank

APPLICATION REPORT – 23/00445/FUL**Validation Date: 30 May 2023****Ward: Euxton****Type of Application: Full Planning****Proposal: Erection of two stable buildings, covered midden and other associated development including sand paddock, stone access tracks, grasscrete parking area and an amended vehicular access from Runshaw Lane (resubmission)****Location: Land 150M West Of Oakfields And 197 Runshaw Lane Euxton****Case Officer: Mr Iain Crossland****Applicant: Mr Trevor Howarth Brantwood Support Services****Agent: Mr Trevor Howarth Brantwood Support Services****Consultation expiry: 21 June 2023****Decision due by: 25 July 2023**

RECOMMENDATION

1. It is recommended that planning permission is refused for the following reason:

The proposed development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and, therefore, harmful by definition. There would also be other harm to the Green Belt through encroachment into the countryside. It is not considered that there are very special circumstances to overcome the definitional harm to the Green Belt and additional harm from encroachment of the countryside. The proposal is, therefore, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework.

SITE DESCRIPTION

2. The application site is located within the Green Belt on the western side of Runshaw Lane in a rural part of the parish of Euxton. The dwelling of no.197 Runshaw Lane (Oakfields) is located on the opposite side of Runshaw Lane to the east of the application site. The site consists of open grassland with hedges to the site boundaries and is part of a larger area of pasture. There is an existing gated access located towards the northern end of the site within the eastern site boundary. The character of the area is that of open agricultural land with sporadic dwellings and agricultural buildings and some ribbon development along the main highways. Field boundaries are defined by trees and hedges.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

3. The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of two stable buildings, a covered midden and other associated development including a sand paddock, stone access tracks, grasscrete parking area and an amended vehicular access from Runshaw Lane. This would provide a commercial equestrian facility offering livery and schooling amongst other provision. The application is a resubmission of a previously refused application (ref. 22/01166/FUL) and is identical in the development sought.

4. The proposed two stables buildings would each measure 27.4m by 6.1m, including an overhang, and would have dual pitched roofs with a maximum height of approximately 3.3m. They would be faced in timber cladding with a roof laid in fibre cement sheets. Each building would comprise six stables and an ancillary store. These would be positioned at the southern end of the site facing one another leaving a concrete yard between the buildings. There would be a small covered midden store to the western end of the buildings and a sand paddock to the north measure approximately 20m by 50m. There would be an access road of approximately 90m in length providing vehicular access to Runshaw Lane the north and a grasscrete car park of approximately 62m by 5.6m to the eastern side of the site.

REPRESENTATIONS

5. No representations have been received.

CONSULTATIONS

6. Greater Manchester Ecology Unit: No comments have been received.
7. Lancashire County Council Highway Services (LCC Highway Services): Are of the opinion that the proposed erection of two stable buildings, covered midden and other associated development including sand paddock, stone access tracks, grasscrete parking area and an amended vehicular access from Runshaw Lane will have a detrimental impact on highway safety in the immediate vicinity of the site and should be refused on highway safety issues.
8. The applicant has responded to the issues raised by LCC Highways, however, LCC have failed to confirm the acceptability of the details.
9. Euxton Parish Council: No comments have been received.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Principle of development

10. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. This means that development proposals that accord with the development plan should be approved without delay.
11. The Framework is supportive of sustainable development in rural areas and most specifically in the context of this rural site states at paragraph 83 that Local Authorities should *support the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings and promote the development and diversification of agricultural and other land based rural enterprises*. The proposed development would support the establishment of a new equestrian business.
12. Support for rural businesses is reflected in the Central Lancashire Core Strategy Policy 13, with the caveat that such proposals should not undermine the purposes of the Green Belt.
13. This part of the Borough is not specified as an area for growth within Core Strategy Policy 1 and falls to be considered as an 'other place'. Criterion (f) of Core Strategy Policy 1 reads as follows:
 "In other places – smaller villages, substantially built up frontages and Major Developed Sites – development will typically be small scale and limited to appropriate infilling, conversion of buildings and proposals to meet local need, unless there are exceptional reasons for larger scale redevelopment schemes." The proposed development would be small scale.
14. With regard to the location of the site in the Green Belt, the Framework states that there is a general presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt except in a limited

number of specific circumstances. National guidance on Green Belt is contained in Chapter 13 of the Framework, which states:

137. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.

138. Green Belt serves five purposes:

- a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;*
- b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;*
- c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;*
- d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and*
- e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.*

147. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

148. When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

149. A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:

- a) buildings for agriculture and forestry;*
- b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;*
- c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;*
- d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;*
- e) limited infilling in villages;*
- f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and*
- g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:*
 - not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or*
 - not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.*

15. Paragraph 150 of the Framework identifies certain other forms of development that are also not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. This includes b) engineering operations.

16. The proposed development would support a commercial equestrian facility and falls to be considered as a facility for outdoor recreation, in accordance with the definition in the Framework outlined above, and is identified as an exception to inappropriate development in the Green Belt under paragraph 149.b). However, paragraph 149.b) states that such facilities are not inappropriate only where they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.

17. A relevant High Court case *R. (on the application of Boot) v Elmbridge Borough Council* [2017] at the time of the previous National Planning Policy Framework 2012 concludes that

paragraph 89 of the 2012 Framework, which is repeated at paragraph 149.b) of the current Framework, does not permit any harm at all to the openness of the Green Belt. A development that would have any adverse impact on openness would not comply with a policy that required openness to be maintained or preserved. The decision-maker therefore has no latitude to find otherwise. There would have to be very special circumstances to justify a grant of planning permission.

18. Any harm to the openness of the Green Belt therefore means that the test in paragraph 149.b) cannot be met. New buildings in this location would inevitably have an impact on openness as the site is currently free from any development or buildings. Whilst the proposed stable buildings would be relatively low level structures, the footprint and the enclosure that they would create would be significant in the context of a currently open field. Their location close to the south eastern field boundary would make them a visually prominent feature from public vantage points along Runshaw Lane as the site is open to views from the public highway in this location. This would result in a clear visual impact on openness. There would also be a spatial impact on openness given that the field is currently free from any development and the proposed development would result in a significant amount of built form. As the development would fail to preserve openness it would not comply with any of the exceptions to inappropriate development in the Green Belt and is therefore harmful by definition.
19. As it has been established, that the development of the site with stables buildings is inappropriate development in the Green Belt, which results in definitional harm to the Green Belt, any other harm caused by the development must also be considered and added to the definitional harm.
20. There are five purposes of the Green Belt as detailed above. The development of the application site would involve the construction of a road, buildings and a sand paddock resulting in development encroaching into the countryside that is currently an area of open grassland pasture. This results in a clear incursion of built form within an undeveloped part of the Green Belt.
21. On the basis of the above it is considered that there is other harm to the Green Belt caused by the harm to purpose 3 of including land in the Green Belt, as the proposed buildings result in a degree of encroachment into the countryside.
22. The proposed car park, access track and sand paddock could also be considered as an engineering operation and can, therefore, be considered under exception (b) of paragraph 150 of the Framework. These would be low-lying surface structures; however, they would occupy an undeveloped area of land, which is laid to grass and is part of a field. This built form, combined with the use of the areas would have some impact on the openness of the Green Belt, although it is recognised that they would not be in use on a permanent basis. When in use, they would also have a greater visual impact compared to the existing situation. The identified impacts from these aspects of the development would be transient but nonetheless, this results in some harm to openness. Where harm to openness is identified, it cannot be said that openness is 'preserved'. Further, introducing these aspects of development would result in encroachment of the Countryside, as explained above.
23. As the proposed development would result in definitional harm to the Green Belt and other harm through encroachment there would have to be very special circumstances to justify the grant of planning permission that would outweigh this harm. The applicant's Planning Statement and Equestrian Justification identifies the following:

“Economic Benefits - In terms of economic benefits, there is a shortage of facilities of the type proposed in the area. It is planned that the centre will be an accredited BHS centre which has significant economic benefits. There are now more than 960 BHS Approved Centres in the UK, Ireland and worldwide, but within 10 miles of Chorley there are only three BHS accredited riding schools (Parbold Equestrian Centre, Landlords Farm Riding Centre and Moorview Equestrian Centre) and of these, only Parbold is a BHS accredited livery

stable. With accreditation therefore, the facility would be rare and would provide a comprehensive facility for the Chorley area.

A business plan is enclosed that shows that although it is a not for profit enterprise, the facility will still be sustainable over time.

The development will provide specialist employment for two full time apprentices to start with overseen by Darcey Parr and Zoe Draper on a part-time basis. In subsequent years as the business develops, an additional two part-time staff would be required.

Darcey is an extremely competent and well respected horsewoman and needs a base to operate from for lessons etc - this is available through the applicant and Darcey and Zoe could not afford to do it without his help. The applicant does not own any more suitable land elsewhere. It is not an opportunity available anywhere else in the area.

The range of facilities and activities proposed is in very short supply in the area. This has been compounded by the closure and redevelopment of the Squires Equestrian site off Lucas Lane which provided roughly 35 stables and 13.27 hectares of land for grazing. The site is situated between the M61 motorway to the east, and the defined settlement boundary of Whittle-le-Woods which is to the west.

This land was sold to Redrow who were granted permission to develop up to 250 dwellings. A substantial group of stables and land once used for riding lessons and grazing have therefore been lost.

There is a general shortage of stable yards in the area with many having been redeveloped such as the Lucas Lane site. A review of sources of equestrian properties such as UK Land and Farms has shown that there is little or no such facilities currently available in the area. There is demand in the area and a lack of appropriate alternative locations.

Social and Recreational Benefits - these are considerable. As is highlighted in the NPPF, active recreation such as horse riding and associated activities are wholly appropriate to the open countryside. Covid has also resulted in a substantially increased demand for access to the countryside.

The proposed operators are well known and highly regarded (see Appendix 1), but currently have no facility to operate from. The facilities will not only be used for teaching purposes and for children's pony parties, but will also be used for social benefit and educational purposes such as Shaftesbury High School where Darcey has strong links. It is estimated in the UK that around 2-5% of school-age children have ADHD. This is the most common behavioural disorder in the country. The provision of outdoor activities in an engaging and stimulating environment has been shown to address these issues. Being able to work with others is a key quality – it helps at school, in sport and is essential in later life. Having the skills to empathise with others affects school cohesion, friendships and well-being.

In a new environment, situation or group such as would be provided at the centre, new communication skills are learned. Being able to communicate effectively, especially in different and often strange and exciting situations, accelerates these skills in the way that ideas and information is shared. Children's listening skills are also enhanced through learning from activity leaders and from dealing with the animals and outdoors activities. The centre would therefore enhance and support educational facilities in the area by providing a safe environment for young people to work and engage in equine related outdoor activities, where they can build confidence and improve communication skills through interaction with horses and ponies.

Environmental Benefits - The provision of enhanced landscaping and planting generally will reduce the impact upon the local countryside and will assist with containing the development visually. It will allow greater use of a part of the countryside and improve accessibility for the wider community and significantly enhance the area. Additional planting will also increase the biodiversity of the area."

24. There is no reason to doubt the extensive experience, enthusiasm, or professionalism in anyone involved in this planning application. There is also no reason to doubt that the proposed development could become a successful and well used facility and that there may be demand for such facilities. It is not considered, however, that the above benefits of the scheme either individually or cumulatively represent the very special circumstances required to outweigh the identified harm to the Green Belt, which must be afforded substantial weight. The applicant's case could be readily replicated through similar proposals at other sites in the Borough. It is, therefore, considered that the proposal is unacceptable in principle.

Details of the proposed development

25. The Central Lancashire Rural Development SPD sets out more detailed guidance in relation to the type of equestrian development that would be suitable in rural areas. The SPD sets out matters relating to scale, siting, design, site treatment, highway safety and reinstatement. These are assessed below:
26. *Scale: For development proposals involving more than three horses, the applicant should submit a statement with the planning application detailing why accommodation of the size proposed is required.*
27. It is considered that the supporting information submitted with the planning application sufficiently justifies that the scale of development would meet its intended purpose, as described earlier in this report.
28. *Siting: new buildings should not harm the landscape character of the surrounding area. They should be well related to existing trees, hedges or landscape features, avoiding prominent positions, and generally at least 30 metres away from neighbouring residential properties. There should be proper screening for car and horse-box parking and appropriate arrangements for manure storage and/or management.*
29. The proposed stables buildings would be positioned close to the southern and eastern boundary of the site relatively close to the highway and the field boundary. Whilst some planting is proposed between the development and highway, it would still be highly visible from public vantage points, despite the presence of trees and hedges to the boundaries. As such the development would inevitably have some impact on the open landscape character of the area. The proposed stables buildings would be located in excess of 30m from the nearest property on Runshaw Lane and would be partially screened from the dwelling by intervening vegetation. The proposal fails to comply with this element of the SPD due to its visually prominent position.
30. *Design/materials: traditional designs will generally be the most appropriate, clad externally in timber and with an internal timber frame, with a maximum ridge height of 3.5 metres for stables. Tack rooms and hay stores should be part of the same building, and each should be of a similar size to an individual stable.*
31. The proposed stables buildings have a ridge height of less than 3.5m, which meets with the guideline set out in the Rural Development SPD. The accommodation that is included is generally accepted for stables, and the buildings would be timber clad and of a traditional outward appearance.
32. *Site treatment: hard-standing areas, access tracks and sand paddocks should be of the minimum size necessary and should not encroach on the open countryside. Careful consideration will be required for the design of storage or parking of horse boxes on site, and fencing should be appropriate to the local vernacular and not suburban in appearance. Sand paddocks should utilise existing ground levels unless absolutely necessary and should not appear built out of the ground and thus alien to the natural contours of the land. Where a sand paddock needs to be above ground level an assessment of its visual impact would be required and appropriate mitigation incorporated into the design. Floodlighting of sand paddocks and yards is generally inappropriate in the open countryside or near to*

neighbouring residents. Where floodlighting is proposed, it should be designed to minimise light spillage from the lit area.

33. As previously discussed, the proposal would result in encroachment of the countryside and so the proposal fails to meet the requirements of the SPD in this regard.
34. *Highway safety/bridleway use: the movement of horses or vehicles resulting from the siting of stables should not create danger to horses and riders, or to other road users. Stables are best sited to have safe and convenient access to the bridleway network or minor roads, although existing bridleways should not become over-intensively used as a result of the development. Wherever possible there should be a designated turning area within the site so that lorries, horse-boxes or towed trailers do not have to be reversed either on or off the highway.*
35. LCC Highway Services has responded raising concerns in relation to parking and access. It is, however, considered that these issues could be overcome with the imposition of planning conditions.
36. *Re-statement: A condition would normally be recommended, which would require the removal of the stables building and restoration of the land to its former condition if the authorised use ceases for a period exceeding one year, in order to protect the appearance of the countryside.*
37. Such a condition could be attached to any grant of planning permission for the proposed development.
38. Paragraph 40 of the SPD states: *"The Councils will require the following criteria to be met in considering applications for developments involving horses:*
- *in the case of indoor facilities or commercial stables, the development is within an existing building or forms part of a farm diversification scheme;*
 - *in the case of small, private developments the site should be close to existing buildings and well screened by existing trees or local landscape features;*
 - *the development would not result in the over-intensive use of the local bridleway network;*
 - *the movement of either horses or vehicles as a result of the development would not prejudice road safety;*
 - *provision for removing any equipment and re-instating the site once its use for horses is no longer required"*
39. The proposal is for a commercial stables and is not within an existing building or part of a farm diversification scheme. Overall, the proposal fails to comply with all of the criteria set out in the Rural Development SPD, most specifically in relation to its location and siting.

Impact on neighbour amenity

40. The proposed stables buildings are sited approximately 30m from the nearest residential property to the east side of Runshaw Lane. This complies with the 30m guideline set out in the Rural Development SPD. The proposed buildings are of modest height and therefore the degree of separation is such that it is not considered that there would be an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of any residential occupiers. The proposed development would result in an increased intensity of use at the site, bringing activity to the site and vehicular journeys. Given the degree of separation it is not considered that there would be an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of any residential occupiers, subject to the imposition of conditions governing hours of use and prevention of flood lighting and sound amplification.

Highway safety

41. The proposed development would result in a 12no. stable equestrian facility with sand paddock and access road from Runshaw Lane. LCC Highway Services have considered the proposal and have made the following observations.

42. Runshaw Lane is a rural lane, which is a route for a local college and links villages to Leyland. The lane has in this location grass verge on either side of the carriageway with hedging on the highway boundary. There is limited street lighting and the lane has a 40mph speed limit. The site does not offer a safe pedestrian route to bus stops on Leyland Lane. It is presumed that visitors to the site would arrive by car or minibus. The route is suitable for cyclists.
43. The requested sightline splays were drawn incorrectly on the site plan and were requested to be to the near-side edge of carriageway, not the opposite side of the carriageway.
44. With regards to the access it was requested that the sightlines were shown 2.4m from the rear of the carriageway to the nearside carriageway edge. The sight lines of 2.4m x 102m to be provided in both directions from the centre of the site access onto Runshaw Lane.
45. The site line requirement is, based on the basic formula for calculating Stopping Sight Distances (SSD) in 10.1 from Manual for Streets 2, the addition of 2.4m the classified speed of the road of 40mph. There is an oak tree, which may be obstructing the sightline splay and this is requested to be shown.
- | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|------|
| 40mph the desirable | 102m absolute | 81m |
| 50mph the desirable | 148m absolute | 114m |
| 60mph the desirable | 201m absolute | 152m |
| 70mph the desirable | 262m absolute | 196m |
46. The applicant was requested to provide accurate details of the required sight line requirement, before determining the application, ensuring the entire sight line requirement is fully over land within the applicant's control and/or over the adopted highway and to fully show all works which would be required to provide the sight lines. The sight line splays would require walls, fences, trees, hedges, shrubs, ground growth, structures etc. to have a maximum height of 1.0m above the height at the centre line of the adjacent carriageway.
47. It was requested that the applicant described the use of the facility in detail with regards to vehicle movements for the times for the staff, lessons, therapy, pony parties etc. This is to ensure the parking is sufficient for the proposed uses and to ensure the applicant allows for the drop off and collection of users. The grass-crete parking was requested to show parking bay dimensions to show the available car parking.
48. The stables are liveried with the owners expected to book the sand paddock at times. It is also expected that other local horse owners may book the sand paddock. It was requested that the parking and turning for a large horse wagon is shown.
49. A turning area is required to allow refuse vehicle and emergency vehicles to turn within the site for the following reasons: -
- The maximum distance a refuse vehicle should reverse is 12m, from Manual for streets and BS5930: 2005.
 - Fire and rescue Services Section should not have to reverse more than 20m from the end of an access road. From Manual for streets and diagram 24 of Approved Document B (Fire Safety).
50. The applicant was requested to prove the turning area layout by swept path analysis for a twin axel refuse vehicle. The applicant was requested to provide accurate details of the required turning area before determining the application and the turning area protected under condition, for perpetuity.
51. The widening of the access requires the culvert over the ditch being extended / replaced. Technical approval of the culverted water course may be required from Lancashire County Councils "Flood Risk Management" team. The applicant would be requested to enter into a s278 agreement for the formation of the culvert and access and full details could be provided in response to a condition.

52. In the absence of these details LCC Highway Services confirmed that they were unable to support the application
53. The applicant responded to this providing an amended updated site plan with revised sight lines and a parking layout with a turning circle and parking for the horse waggon shown. In response to the request for further details in respect of the use of the facility the applicant confirmed that it is intended that owners would access the site at around 7am. There would be two staff in attendance, and it is likely that some owners who have booked livery, would have their horses attended upon by the staff.
54. Lessons and arranged visits to the site would commence at 10am and all would be pre-booked. Lessons would be on a one to one basis during the daytime. After school group lessons, of no more than six persons within the group, would take place at the site. School booking's would be by minibus taking in one minibus per visit. Pony Parties would be on Saturday and Sunday and during school holidays.
55. LCC Highway Services were asked for further comments in relation to the additional information provided by the applicant, however, this has not been received at the time of writing. It is considered that conditions could be attached to any grant of planning permission requiring details of site access, culvert design and hours of use and it is noted that the parking layout has been confirmed, however, it is unknown as to whether the visibility and internal manoeuvring issues have been overcome.

Flood risk and drainage

56. The application site is not located in an area that is at risk of flooding from pluvial or fluvial sources, according to Environment Agency mapping data. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), the site should be drained on a separate system and in the most sustainable way possible.
57. The NPPG clearly outlines the hierarchy to be investigated by the developer when considering a surface water drainage strategy. As such the developer should consider the following drainage options in the following order of priority:
- a. into the ground (infiltration);
 - b. to a surface water body;
 - c. to a surface water sewer, highway drain, or another drainage system;
 - d. to a combined sewer.
58. Any development of the site should incorporate a surface water drainage system that has been designed in line with the hierarchy set out above.

Ecology

59. Policy BNE9 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026 seeks to safeguard protected and endangered species and their habitats. There are no known ecological reasons why the application should be refused permission, subject to conditions being attached to ensure biodiversity enhancement measures are employed at the site and works take place outside of bird nesting season. The proposal is, therefore, considered to comply with Policy BNE9 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026.

Other issues

60. It is noted that outline planning permission, ref. 13/00566/OUT, was granted in 2013 for the erection of three stables and a tack room at the application site. The proposal was, however, of a much smaller scale, for private use, in a different position and was determined under a different Local Plan and SPD, compared to the current proposal. The assessment of facilities for outdoor sport and recreation in the Green Belt has also evolved in response to case law relating to facilities for outdoor sport and recreation in the Green Belt that has emerged since this time.

CONCLUSION

61. The proposed development of the site for stables buildings and associated infrastructure is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and results in other harm to the Green Belt through the degree of encroachment into the countryside. The design and scale of the proposed stables buildings is appropriate and is consistent with a private stables development, however, this does not overcome the harm to the Green Belt. It is not considered that there are very special circumstances to overcome the definitional harm to the Green Belt and additional harm caused through encroachment. It is, therefore, recommended that the application be refused.

RELEVANT POLICIES: In accordance with s.38 (6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004), the application is to be determined in accordance with the development plan (the Central Lancashire Core Strategy, the Adopted Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026 and adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance), unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Consideration of the proposal has had regard to guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the development plan. The specific policies/guidance considerations are contained within the body of the report.

RELEVANT HISTORY OF THE SITE

Ref: 13/00566/OUT **Decision:** PEROPP **Decision Date:** 14 August 2013
Description: Erection of a group of 3 stables plus tack room and change of use of field from agricultural to equestrian use for domestic animals (horses)


Ref: 22/01166/FUL **Decision:** REFFPP **Decision Date:** 20 January 2023
Description: Erection of two stable buildings, covered midden and other associated development including sand paddock, stone access tracks, grasscrete parking area and an amended vehicular access from Runshaw Lane

Location Plan

Site Address: Easting: 352903 Northing: 419098

Date Produced: 22-May-2023

Scale: 1:1250 @A4



Planning Portal Reference: PP-12179798v1

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning
Committee Meeting

12 September 2023



Item 3c

23/00445/FUL


Land 150M West Of Oakfields And 197 Runshaw Lane, Euxton

Erection of two stable buildings, covered midden and other associated development including sand paddock, stone access tracks, grasscrete parking area and an amended vehicular access from Runshaw Lane (resubmission)

Location plan




Aerial photo




Site plan



Proposed plans and elevations




Proposed Ground Floor Plan
Scale (1:100)




Proposed North Elevation
Scale (1:100)



Proposed East Elevation
Scale (1:100)



Proposed South Elevation
Scale (1:100)



Proposed West Elevation
Scale (1:100)

Site photo



Site photo



Site photo and existing access



Site photo



C O M M I T T E E R E P O R T		
REPORT OF	MEETING	DATE
Head of Planning and Enforcement	Planning Committee	Date 12 September 2023

ADDENDUM

ITEM 3a - 20/01378/FULMAJ – Formerly Mormon Church, Water Street, Chorley

The recommendation remains as per the original report

(3)No. further letters of objection have been received setting out the following issues:

- Development would exacerbate current drainage issues.
- The land is unstable and unsuitable to develop
- Ecological impacts
- Amenity impacts
- Health and well being impacts

ITEM 3b - 23/00616/PIP – Whitegates, 75 Gorsey Lane, Mawdesley

The recommendation remains as per the original report

(1)No. further letters neither objecting to or supporting the Planning Application have been received setting out the following issues:

- Highway safety concerns.
- The dwellings are not proposed as being “affordable”.
- There are apartments at Stocks Hall for those over 50, and they are still on the market, which could question need.
- Impact on privacy of nearby occupiers.

(8)No. further letters of support have been received on the following basis:

- Much needed accommodation for downsizing.
- Meets a local need providing housing for older people.
- Would help to maintain the community.
- The land serves no purpose currently.
- The site is dilapidated.
- Development would have very little impact on highways and drainage.
- Health and well being benefits.
- The development would free up larger homes for families.
- There is a housing crisis and more houses are needed.
- The benefits outweigh the harm to the Green Belt

The following consultee responses have been received:

Mawdesley Parish Council submitted the following comments on 08 September 2023:

We have spent a lot of time considering our comments to this application, as initially if we just look at the 'headlines' - up to 9 new residences built on Greenbelt within a plot of about an acre, it would normally be a fairly open and shut case and an objection on the usual grounds for us.

However, given the quite specific nature of the proposal, I do think it deserves some further thought and we would urge the Planning Committee to consider the following points:

Firstly, there is rarely a Parish Council meeting that goes by when we discuss planning matters when the comments made don't arise as to the continuing proliferation of 'executive homes' and yet another 4/5 bed property being built or extended from a smaller property.

We have also commented on many occasions that our ageing population would benefit from more smaller, and ideally single storey properties being built. Given this, we would also like to request a clause, as Agricultural Restriction, which states that these properties must remain as true bungalows.

This scheme therefore seems to fulfil a variety of needs - it provides the accommodation that we all believe would be popular with the age bracket in question, and in doing so, potentially frees up a number of larger houses which are currently occupied by older couples or single people whose families have now left home, creating opportunities for the younger, growing families of the village to access more appropriate accommodation.

On the matter of being in Greenbelt. If this development was in a location that had not seen any recent building and several applications approved in Greenbelt, then we would probably have a different opinion. However, within a section of less than 100 yards of Gorse Lane, there have been 6 approvals for properties - some claiming volume from other buildings, but 6 new residences nonetheless.

Add to this that the proposed bungalow development wouldn't actually have any road frontage (as it's behind two new houses fronting onto Gorse Lane - both recently approved in the same area of Greenbelt) and we have less to object to than the variety of much larger houses in exactly the same location that Chorley Council have already approved.

The National Planning Policy Framework defines inappropriate development in the Greenbelt as follows:

147. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

148. When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

The key factor that has been used in a number of recent applications (that we have actually objected to) such as the Robin Hood development and the two new properties at Mayfield on Bluestone Lane is whether the proposal causes harm to the Greenbelt, or indeed that the benefits of the development outweigh the potential 'harm'.

In those instances, it was found that there were 'very special circumstances' to allow the application to proceed, whereby the benefits outweighed the harm to Greenbelt. Many of our residents would dispute that contention in relation to the two aforementioned applications, but in this case, I do believe that there are genuine 'very special circumstances' which do outweigh the potential harm, particularly given that the very same half dozen acres or so has already had 6 properties approved for building upon in the last couple of years.

If this proposal was within the settlement area in the centre of the village, I know that the vast majority of residents would be massively in favour but sadly the land available within the settlement area has mostly already been earmarked by larger developers and we suspect that they won't be falling over themselves to build bungalows for our older generations.

However, having said all the above, we do also think that the density of the proposal is perhaps too high, and that slightly fewer properties would sit better within the proposed site.

There is also a potential issue with the access onto Gorsey Lane. Whilst this has already been approved as suitable for the two houses at the front of the development, the additional traffic could cause an issue. We would therefore suggest a re-think of the access, perhaps to widen the splays and set the access slightly further back into the site, allowing for better vision for traffic both entering and leaving the site but also passing traffic in both directions.

Furthermore, we believe there is also great potential here to create a much more 'eco-friendly' development - the addition of rainwater harvesting to feed toilets for example, sedum roofs, permeable surfaces etc etc which could all be stipulated as a condition of development and in turn would offset any perceived harm to the Greenbelt.

We also understand that the applicant is minded to gift the remainder of the land behind the proposed development so that a wildlife/conservation area could be created. The history of that site also used to include a large attenuation pond, which was filled in when the land was razed some years ago. If this pond was reinstated, that would aid any potential drainage issues from surface water run off created by these new buildings as well as creating a nice environment and access to the public footpath network beyond that leads over to a Tarnbeck Drive and the village centre.

On balance, we would therefore support this application, subject to some revisions to the scale and trying to limit any issues created in relation to surface water drainage etc along with the reinstatement of the pond and the creation of a wildlife area.

Lancashire County Council Highways have made the following comments:

LCC Highways does not have any objections regarding the proposed permission in principle application for up to 9 new build older persons accessible bungalow dwellings and are of the opinion that the proposed development will not have a significant impact on highway safety, capacity or amenity in the immediate vicinity of the site.

The amended drawings show a radius kerbed access and 2m wide footway fronting the site. The internal layout of the site shows that the proposal including the two permitted developments can be to adoptable standards.

The original report has been amended as follows:

Paragraph 26 of the report refers to enhanced open space, which it is implied would become public open space. The report sets out that this is a benefit considered to carry moderate weight as a social benefit. It is noted, however, that the area of land implied as possible public open space lies outside the red edge application site and therefore no weight can be attributed to this as it would not be secured through any grant of permission in principle.
