

Town Hall Market Street Chorley Lancashire PR7 1DP

22 April 2009

Dear Councillor

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - WEDNESDAY, 22ND APRIL 2009

The following report was tabled at the above meeting of the Development Control Committee.

Agenda No Item

9. **Addendum** (Pages 55 - 60)

Report of Corporate Director (Business) circulated at the meeting

Yours sincerely

Donna Hall Chief Executive

Dianne Scambler
Democratic and Member Services Officer
E-mail:dianne.scambler@chorley.gov.uk

onna Hall.

Tel: (01257) 515034 Fax: (01257) 515150

> This information can be made available to you in larger print or on audio tape, or translated into your own language. Please telephone 01257 515118 to access this service.

આ માહિતીનો અનુવાદ આપની પોતાની ભાષામાં કરી શકાય છે. આ સેવા સરળતાથી મેળવવા માટે કૃપા કરી, આ નંબર પર ફોન કરો: 01257 515822 ان معلومات کار جمد آ کی اپنی زبان میں بھی کیا جاسکتا ہے۔ بیضد مت استعال کرنے کیلئے براہ مہر بانی اس نمبر پرٹیلیفون سیجئے: 01257 515823

COMMITTEE REPORT			
REPORT OF	MEETING	DATE	ITEM NO
Corporate Director (Business)	Development Control Committee	22/04/09	

ADDENDUM

ITEM 1: 09/00024/FUL – Erection of multi-use games area including provision of 3m steel fencing, tarmac playing surface and access footpaths. Land 80m east of Buckshaw Primary School Chancery Road Astley Village.

The Parish Council have submitted the following document for the Committee's attention:

Astley Village Parish Council

PLANNING APPLICATION FACTS - 09/00024/FUL

- 1. The Multi Use Games Area project is not an Astley Village Parish Council project. It is a project devised by young residents who were assisted by youth workers to find out what they wanted in the village, and get funding.
 - Astley Village Parish Council presently has involvement in the project because it was requested to agree to maintain the facility (if built), act as Bankers for the grant fund, and latterly to submit a planning application.
- 2. Astley Village Parish Council took a majority vote at a meeting on the 7 January 2009 to submit a planning application for the Multi-Use Games Area at the site on Chancery Road
 - The decision above still stands. Astley Village Parish Council has not revoked or changed this decision.
- 3. Residents of Astley Village were informed of the position of the Games Area via a newsletter article published in the Parish Council's newsletter in September 2008 (copy below). The article identified to residents a suggested position (the one specified on the planning application) and further, asked for 'views or thoughts' from residents.
 - A further article was published in the following newsletter, December 2008 (copy below) this identified again to residents the suggested site and went on to say the issue would go through the planning process.
- 4. The site location for the Games Area was not chosen by the Astley Village Parish Council, it was offered by Chorley Council as their contribution towards the young people's project. The offered site was then specified in the funding bid to Lancashire County Council and the funds approved against the details of the application bid. The site is more than 14.5 metres from the road edge.
- 5. The Parish Council was informed that alternative sites had been considered during the period running up to the funding bid being submitted which were unsuitable and unavailable.

Hall Gate car park - Chorley Council could not give permission for a Games Area to be built on there and the Police did not endorse. Land immediately behind Buckshaw School or on spare land near to Westway on the Westway playing fields was also not acceptable to Chorley Council (landowner) or Police.

- 6. To reiterate, the position of Astley Village Parish Council still remains that it has taken a majority decision to submit a planning application for a Games Area on the site adjacent to Chancery Road. This application was not rejected by the Statutory Development Control Committee of the Planning Authority but recommended for Approval.
- 7. The amount of statutory consultation required by a planning application has been exceeded in this planning application:
 - The whole of Astley Village were informed of the project and the proposed site location on two separate occasions within the Parish Council newsletter (September 2008 and December 2008).
 - Over and above the 'affected' residents being consulted as per planning guidelines, a total of 64 letters were hand delivered on 11 December 2008 to all residents of Harewood, The Baron's Rest, Browns Hey, Banastre, Clough Acre and Millcroft - letter and addresses were submitted with the application.
 - Support documents with the planning application included a copy of a Places for People survey of 38 properties and a petition of 62 signatures collected by the young applicants seeking support for the games area.
 - Development Control consulted by letter, and public notices, to the affected residents as part of their normal procedures.
 - Objections were sent in to Development Control but, the village has a population of over 3,330 people, the quantity of objection letters was minimal, 2%, and cannot reflect a 'majority' view or the whole villages view.

Astley Village Parish Council 20 April 2009

Below are extract from Astley Village Parish Council newsletters.

September 2008 newsletter front page (highlighted in yellow)



There is quite alo; of news to report since relast newsletter in June.

article on pg.4. The Council agreed, but only after I had to use my cashing vote, to calchrate Christinas filis year and it will be providing a tree with lights in the village and will be sistered on the green is front of the shape. It is planted to have a Caro Singing occurring before

The Parish Council provided a grant Action Village Junions FC who time organised a three week summer apo programme over at Chorley RUFC. In secon this was till to have an over the way till to be to do and to secon this way till to be to do and to and the second till the second till the till the second second till the second till the second se

the last mensisters in June.

Despite the abovery weather the Astley in Desni Open General seasons weather the Astley in Denni Open General seasons that did not been compared a sample of the Astley of the Charles were did not been compared to the product with the valley from the product of the Astley Village this the valley makes provided to be popular with the contractive or young shiften and the Lastles from the Village war using active Astley Hall active compared young shiften and the Lastles from the Village open the Astley Hall are compared to the compared to the product of the Astley Hall, it was a pleasure doing the charles and potential to talk with semantic provided the contractive of the Astley Hall, it was a pleasure doing the charles to talk with semantic provided the contractive of the Charles Talk Charles and potential to the Charles Talk Charles and potential to the Charles Talk Charles

trues and gothing the chance to talk with so many residents.

A big thank you to those in the village street characters are granters. They tooked brillian and analyshewed Astley Village at its times.

The Littler Astler receiving held in James can assume the number of residents join in with Councillon and they counted the filter picts and granters in the p. Littlering Countel limitally provided a fire several counters to be published a fire several counters of imposite the filter picts and present in the p. Littlering Countel limitally provided a fire several counters. The receiver of imposite the summer. The receiver of imposite the several receiver and the published and the picts of the several counters of imposite the several counters of imposite

would like to say on behalf of whate a log thank you to CSM. Banks and PCSD Pik blood who moved on to new areas. Store is to work over in South West Charles congratulations to Pik who has been paulice officer. They beth made a palice officer.

December 2008 newsletter back cover, (first column, last sentence in the last paragraph)

Public Multi Use Games area for Children and Young People

Dio you accyala

Policy (Polyviny) shloridet eg Frand
 Polic (Polyviny) shloridet eg Frand
 teye, ching film, hottes for squash,
mineral varier and sharpoo.
 Ramblers

of has again this year, as ted a sack of daffodils to be willage. Also a generous mor, for our caretakers use.

That's plastics. What else can we do?

The walks programme can printed from the Astley Village web



Council naves...

This newsletter is publish March, June, September a December:

The Perish Council has to notice boards, one edject to Astay Village Phairns and the junction of Heliga and Charbery Road.

Police and Communities Together Meetings (PACT) PACT meetings on Tuesdays at 7.00 pm in Astley Village Community Centre, Haligate

s 0800 555 111

Two further letters of objection have been received raising the following points

- The MUGA is far too near the public house and off-licence
- Chancery Road and the area around it were designed as a 'village', MUGAs are not rural furniture and more akin to City living where there are no open green spaces
- The MUGA should be built into a quiet safe corner of the playing fields away from the school and all the residential buildings that adjoin the perimeter
- The application should be deferred for more consultation with the residents

One additional letter of support has been received.

For Members information at the time of considering the application 83 individual letters of objection were received and three petitions objecting to the MUGA of 14, 10 and 310 signatures respectively. 51 individual letters of support were received and three petitions of 140, 36, and 11 signatures respectively is support.

ITEM 2: 09/00137/FUL- Split level extensions (two-storey and basement) to rear of existing restaurant, a single storey extension including link to rear of dining room, both to provide staff accommodation, to include taking down and rebuilding of wall to Shaw Brow. 174 Preston Road, Whittle-Le-Woods, Chorley, PR6 7HE.

It should be noted that there is a mistake in the report under the highways and parking paragraph in the assessment, which states that there are double yellow lines on this part of Preston Road. This is incorrect as there are no double yellow lines but a cycle lane. However, it is not considered that this changes the recommendation of the application to approve. The scheme mainly proposes accommodation for the owner and staff, with the only increase in the public area being in the form of a small function room measuring approximately 38m². This aspect is an internal alteration and could therefore be carried out without planning permission even if the application were refused (which is why it was not included in the description of the development). Given this fallback position, which would result in the restaurant having the same amount of public floor space as proposed by the application, the recommendation remains the same.

Whittle-le-Woods Parish Council object to the application on the following grounds:

- The proposal is overdevelopment of the site, how much of a percentage increase in volume does it create?;
- It will dominate the streetscene and is completely out of character with the surrounding properties which are period cottages;
- The development is opposite the listed almshouses (Hill Top Cottages) and there is concern that this development is inappropriate within the vicinity of a listed building:
- The Parish Council is completely against the removal of the dry stone wall as it is an historic feature of the area and it is felt that it will be impossible to reinstate it to its original design and appearance;
- There are concerns Shaw Brow will be shut to undertake construction:

10 letters of objection have been received to the application. These can be summarised as:

The surrounding properties will be dominated and overshadowed by the night and scale of the proposal which will result in a loss of privacy and light and provide an unacceptable sense of enclosure to Shaw Brow;

Agenda Page 58 Agenda Item 9

- The bulk and massing would be visually intrusive and a dominant feature in the streetscene when viewed from a number of angles, including Shaw Brow and the A6:
- The construction of the proposal will cause huge disruption to Shaw Brow which will be unsafe:
- The increase in size will result in more traffic and business to the area and parking on the A6 and Shaw Brow;
- The new function room will increase the amount of excessive noise from the car
 park and bottle bin, especially as screening will be removed so it will be more
 audible. Currently people leave the restaurant at staggered intervals over the
 evening, at a function they will leave at the same time, usually late at night;
- There does not appear to be any landscaping or room for it;
- The gable end [facing down Shaw Brow] will look very stark;
- Damage will be done to the grass strip on Shaw Brow and the stone wall between the site and the allotment to the north;
- The proposal will result in overdevelopment of the site as the character of Preston Road is made up of spacious plots with a relatively low percentage of development, well screened by vegetation;
- No details of the new extraction system have been provided. There are concerns this could cause noise and smells for residents;
- The amount of development on the site would increase rainwater run-off;
- There is confusion over the number parking spaces;
- The level of additional activity including outdoor noise and disturbance is likely to harm residential amenity of neighbouring properties;
- The applicant states that there are no trees or hedges on the site whereas the
 plans show three trees (one of which is a mature evergreen that provides
 screening) and a conifer hedge to be felled. These are important in terms of
 landscape character;
- The proposal will only be 8m away and 7.1m high from the kitchen window of no. 24 Shaw Brow that deprive them of outlook, as they will only see roof. As the slab level of their property is elevated above the application site they will need to maintain the screening hedge at its existing height to preserve their privacy therefore losing light, in addition the proposed roof lights look directly towards no. 24 and will give an impression and feeling of overlooking and loss of privacy;
- No details have been provided of quoins or lintels to see if it fits in with the surroundings;
- There is nothing distinctive about the modern proposal which would detract from the locality with its distinctive traditional stone and rendered cottages. The nationally listed and locally important buildings in the vicinity should be protected from the harmful and unsympathetic design;
- The proposed roofscape of the owners accommodation is inappropriate in terms of massing, visual prominence and scale and the large 'step down' to the next dwelling (no. 22) would mean it would tower over Shaw Brow instead of following the contours of the slope. The design has little respect for the historic, attractive surroundings and would dominate views of Waterhouse Green and at the junction with Far Nook;
- The removal and rebuilding of the stonewall on Shaw Brow would not be to the same standard as currently and would alter the character in a detrimental way;
- The staff and owners accommodation could be incorporated into the hotel business changing the residential nature of Shaw Brow;
- The proposal is contrary to a number of policies in the Local Plan and Supplementary Planning Documents and should be refused;

The majority of these points have been addressed in the report however the following comments are made:

Agenda Page 59 Agenda Item 9

The owners accommodation will have a small garden to the south of the site bounding with no. 24 Shaw Brow. It is considered that having a domestic use against the boundary with this property is the most appropriate to preserve the amenities of this property as much as possible, rather than a commercial part of the building. No. 24 Shaw Brow state they will need to maintain the screening hedge at its existing height, however, the hedge is there at present to preserve privacy as the window faces directly towards the application site. The roof lights have been positioned so they do not result in overlooking or loss of privacy.

The trees to be removed as part of the application would not warrant the protection of a Tree Preservation Order. A condition requiring a landscaping scheme to be submitted is proposed.

A condition is proposed requiring details of any new extraction system to be provided to the satisfaction of the LPA, however it is expected that the existing extraction system will be retained and the extension built around it.

The applicant has contacted LCC Highways regarding the construction of the proposal in relation to Shaw Brow.

An additional condition is proposed relating to the window treatment:

Before development commences, details of the treatment of the proposed external windows and doors in the extension hereby permitted shall have been submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details shall include the materials to be used and their external finish including any reveal (recess), surrounds, cills or lintels.

Reason: In the interest of the character and appearance of the building and in accordance with Policy Nos. GN5 and HS9 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.

Item 3: 08/01242/FUL - Conversion of existing property to create three 1 bedroom flats.

Since the report was written one letter in support of the application has been received and a further letter from one of the existing objectors has been received.

The letter of support is from a local lettings agency stating that there is a shortage of good quality affordable property for single people or couples in the area and the location of the property gives good access to all local amenities and network links to all surrounding employment areas.

The objector has provided photographs of cars blocking the access to the flats and the parking problems caused by the adjacent florist.

The applicant has slightly amended the plans, showing the existing rear window to the bedroom of flat 1 to be returned, instead of being changed to patio doors.

As the proposal is for private rented accommodation the Strategic Housing have confirmed that there are no minimum floor space standards.

LCC Highways have advised that three parking spaces are required for the development. As the applicant has shown how three spaces can be achieved it is not considered that there are sufficient grounds for refusal on highway grounds.

Agenda Page 60

This page is intentionally left blank