

## **APPLICATION REPORT – 19/00361/FULMAJ**

**Validation Date: 24 April 2019**

**Ward: Euxton North**

**Type of Application: Major Full Planning**

**Proposal: Erection of 36no. affordable dwellings with associated parking, landscaping, drainage, layout and other associated works.**

**Location: Playing Field To Rear Of Houses Greenside Euxton**

**Case Officer: Mr Iain Crossland**

**Applicant: Westchurch Homes Ltd**

**Agent: Lichfields**

**Consultation expiry: 11 September 2019**

**Decision due by: 31 December 2019 (Extension of time requested)**

---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

1. It is recommended that planning permission is granted subject to conditions and a S106 legal agreement to secure the provision of affordable housing and an off-site contribution to public open space.

### **SITE DESCRIPTION**

2. The application site is located within the settlement area of Euxton and is allocated for housing under policy HS1.42 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026. It comprises an area of open rough grassland, formerly utilised as a playing pitch, an area of hardstanding to the north eastern corner used for car parking and a small wooded area to the south. The site is generally flat and rectangular in shape extending to approximately 0.67 hectares and is situated to the south and west of Greenside, Euxton.
3. The immediate surrounding area comprises residential dwellings to the north and east of the site. These properties are a mix of bungalows, terraces and semi-detached dwellings. The site is bound to the south by an area of woodland. The adjoining land to the west is currently used as a playing field.

### **DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT**

4. This application seeks planning permission for the erection of 36no. affordable dwellings with associated car parking, landscaping and drainage on land to the south and west of Greenside, Euxton. Vehicular access is proposed from a spur to the existing estate road at Greenside.
5. It is noted that the application as initially submitted was for the erection of 24no. dwellings, of which 18no. were proposed to be private market housing and 6no. affordable housing. This was later amended to a proposal for the erection of 36no. affordable dwellings.

### **REPRESENTATIONS**

6. Representations have been received from the occupiers of 18 addresses citing the following grounds of objection:
- Impact on parking provision locally.
  - Impact on highway safety.
  - Loss of privacy
  - Loss of outlook.
  - Loss of access to rear of existing properties.
  - Creation of a ginnel would be a source of anti-social behaviour
  - The ball stop fence would be oppressive.
  - Impact on property values and saleability of houses.
  - Impact on wildlife and biodiversity.
  - Loss of green space.
  - Lack of amenities and school places to support new residents.
  - No need for more housing.

## CONSULTATIONS

7. Euxton Parish Council 16 May 2019: The objections from the Parish Council are as follows:

1. That detailed application is for 24 dwellings but the allocation in the local plan is only for 17. This is a 41% increase, an increase which will have significant detriment to existing residents of the Greenside estate in terms of traffic and parking - noting that there are very few garages or other off road parking provision on Greenside

2. Planning Policy not adhered to:

(a) Policy BNE9 (Biodiversity and Nature Conservation) seeks to ensure that Biodiversity and Ecological Network resources are protected, conserved, restored and enhanced. The policy sets out requirements all new developments must adhere to in relation to biodiversity, protection of habitats. The application falls short of this requirement.

(b) Policy BNE10 (Trees) states that proposals that would result in the loss of trees, woodland areas or hedgerows which make a valuable contribution to the landscape or setting, will not be permitted. If the benefit of the development outweighs the loss of some trees or hedgerows, replacement planting will be required; contrary to the applicants assertion that the trees are of “relatively low quality” the proposed development will see the removal of several mature oak, beech and ash specimens which contribute hugely to the local landscape, namely Ransnap Wood. Those trees nearest to Ransnap Brook also play a significant role in the biodiversity of the area and in the drainage of the area in so far as they drink a lot of rain water ensuring the stability of the bank.

(c) Policy BNE11 (Species Protection) states that any development which would have an adverse effect on a priority species will not be permitted, unless the benefits outweigh the need to maintain the population of the priority species; the trees are, bar one, all prime specimen oak trees and their removal is not justified. 85 trees (a mix of classic native specimens of oak, ash and beech) are proposed to be removed to accommodate this application! 18 categorised trees (7 Category Bs and 11 Cs) are proposed to be removed and the developer does not propose to replace these due to the small size of the site. Their proposal of planting at the front of each house does not mitigate the loss of 18 magnificent mature trees and as such contravenes Policy BNE10.

3. CS Policy 7 states that for applications proposing 15 or more dwellings that 30% of the dwellings should be affordable. That should be 8 dwellings on the site (at 24 units). The application only proposes 6 affordable units which is only a 25% share.

4. Bats - local residents advise that the area is home to a thriving colony of bats. The Arboricultural Report highlights two oak trees (scheduled for removal) as likely homes for bats.

5. The Arboricultural Report has clearly been written from a perspective of “find something detrimental to say about each tree”. These trees are mature specimens and have never been subjected to any formal management. With the exception of one fire damaged oak,

they are as nature intended - beautiful, majestic trees that contribute significantly to local well being and character of the neighbourhood. To leave only one small oak and one silver birch is not in accordance with planning policy on trees, is hugely detrimental to the environment and the parish council should defend this amenity to the best of its ability.

Permission should be refused on the grounds of the inability to comply with policy BNE 9, 10 & 11 and CS Policy 7.

Euxton Parish Council request that a TPO is placed on any eligible trees.

The Parish Council is aware that the level of 'affordable' housing on the site is less than the percentage required by Chorley's policies and this should be rectified and the Council object to this blatant disregard of Chorley's policies by the developer.

It is noted that the environmental surveys were carried out 'out of season' and the surveys should be re-done 'in season' to establish the bat community.

8. Euxton Parish Council 20 September 2019: The Parish Council has serious concerns over this application which it is felt need to be conditioned on the applications approval:

There should be a robust, ball proof, green metal mesh or net fencing, over 3 metres high erected on this developer's site to protect their development and ultimately the people who will live in the houses. This was CBCs agreement with EPC when the land was taken off them and sold for housing. This will need to be conditioned otherwise it probably won't happen. It needs to be on the developer's land AND, it needs to remain the developer's property and responsibility, so they will have to maintain and fix it when it breaks.

The developer is creating a ginnel between the north edge of their site and the already present housing on Greenside (259 to 267 Greenside). Euxton Parish Council object to this being an access to the football fields as it will become a dark and dangerous narrow access path and, demonstrated by many other ginnels created and abandoned in the village, will become derelict and littery and dirty and, as it will be quite long and in a very dark area will be a serious risk. The Parish Council suggests that the ginnel (which it is presumed necessary for 259-267 bins and access) becomes a gated ginnel for the protection of the Greenside properties with NO access on the to the fields, so the fence mentioned above, would run from the corner of 267 Greenside down the length of the west side of the developers site with no access through at the field side. Also, that this ginnel is conditioned on the developer's planning approval that they should look after the ginnel in the future so it does not become a derelict and dangerous rat run.

The trees which are suggested as 'no value' are actually very valuable and the Parish Council would like the environmental report to be reconsidered as it seems bias towards being able to knock them all down to enable house building rather than assessing their value to the community and wildlife.

9. Greater Manchester Ecology Unit: Have no objection subject to conditions.
10. Lancashire County Council Highway Services: Have no objection subject to conditions.
11. Lead Local Flood Authority: Comments will be reported on the Addendum.
12. United Utilities: Have no objection subject to conditions.
13. Waste & Contaminated Land: Have no objection subject to conditions.
14. Lancashire Fire and Rescue Service: Provide standing advice.
15. Lancashire County Council (Education): Based upon the latest assessment, taking into account all approved applications, LCC will be seeking a contribution for 6 primary school places. However, LCC will not be seeking a contribution for secondary school places

## **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

### Principle of the development

16. 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.
17. The application site is located in the settlement area of Euxton, and is part of an allocated housing site covered by policy HS1.42 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 - 2026. The development of housing on this site is, therefore, considered acceptable in principle. It is noted that the policy HS1.42 estimates that 17 dwellings would be provided on the site, however, this is only an indicative figure and does not preclude the provision of a higher or lower number of dwellings subject to material considerations. It is, however, an important consideration that the site is used to its full potential in order to deliver the necessary housing supply to ensure that the Borough's housing requirement can be achieved.
18. The proposed development is of a relatively high density, which has enabled a higher number of dwellings to be planned across the site. This high density is, however, compatible with the density of the adjacent development to the north.

### Design and impact on the character of the area

19. The proposed development would be located to the south and east of the residential housing estate at Greenside, Euxton. The site is bound by rear gardens to the east, playing fields to the west, woodland to the south and rear gardens and an estate road to the north. As such the site is not visually prominent.
20. The proposed development consists of a single main access road forming a cul-de-sac. The proposed dwellings are traditional two storey design and comprise fourteen 2 bedroom terraced, fourteen 3 bedroom semi-detached and eight 1 bedroom maisonettes. All of the houses have private garden areas. Parking is provided by a mix of private driveways and dedicated surface car parks.
21. The estate road and layout follow a logical pattern and would incorporate a small range of dwelling types of consistent design. The site layout and differences in dwelling types would provide an adequate degree of character, whilst the dwellings themselves would include consistent materials and details that would provide a level of coherence and would reflect materials and features of the existing development to the north and east.
22. The design of the dwellings themselves is traditional in appearance and includes red brickwork and features such, porches, canopies, stone sills, brick dentil courses and some areas of render that would provide diversity and interest to reflect the existing local vernacular and character. It is noted that there is a range of property types in the area and that the proposed dwellings reflect the scale of existing dwellings and the suburban setting.
23. The properties would all have garden areas providing sufficient space for the storage of bins and frontage parking.
24. The overall density of the development would be relatively high but would reflect the suburban character of the area and density of nearby housing, which is appropriate in suburban areas whilst making efficient use of the land available.
25. The site is currently open and free from development, other than the communal parking area. There is a wooded area to the south of the site and, therefore, the proposed development would urbanise, what is currently an open green space. The loss of the trees

would have an impact on public amenity, however, this is inevitable given that the site is allocated for housing. Although very few of the trees would be retained the proposed planting plan shows that the proposal uses space efficiently to incorporate varied tree, hedge and shrub planting. Notably, each dwelling is afforded with ornamental shrub planting to the front. This would provide a some softening of the development, although it is recognised that the new trees would require some time to mature before their full benefit can be realised.

26. The site adjoins land that is currently used as a playing field. There is currently no formal boundary between the application site and the playing fields. The application includes the creation of a formal boundary between the application site and playing fields through the provision of a 0.9m high wall with 2.1m high fence atop. This 3m high boundary would provide adequate protection to residents from balls entering their property. Overall it is considered that the proximity to the existing playing field would not have an adverse impact on future residents.
27. Overall, the layout, design and landscaping of the proposed development is considered acceptable and appropriate in the context of surrounding development and is in accordance with policy 17 of the Core Strategy.

#### Impact on neighbour amenity

28. There are a number of existing dwellings located to the north and east of the site on Greenside that back onto the application site. It is recognised that these properties would lose the currently open aspect to their rear, which would clearly impact on the outlook of the occupiers from these properties. There is, however, a sufficient degree of separation between the existing dwellings at Greenside and the proposed dwellings to ensure that the Council's spacing guidelines are met. As such it is considered that the proposal would not result in any unacceptable impact on amenity for existing residents or the future residents within the development through outlook, light or privacy.
29. The properties at 259 to 267 Greenside have the closest relationship with the site. The degree of separation between these existing dwellings and the proposed dwellings is such that there would be no unacceptable impact on outlook, light or privacy. A shared footpath would be provided between the new dwellings and the existing to provide rear access. This would be gated with access to residents only.
30. The properties at 117 to 135 Greenside back onto the site to the east and are bungalows. The degree of separation between these existing dwellings and the proposed dwellings is such that there would be no unacceptable impact on outlook, light or privacy.
31. The relationship between the proposed dwellings themselves would also be in accordance with the Council's interface guidelines. The proposal is, therefore, considered acceptable in terms of the relationship with the existing surrounding properties and between the proposed properties themselves.
32. The provision of a 3m high ball stop fence has been included at the request of Euxton Parish Council. This would comprise a 0.9m high wall with 2.1m high fence atop. The fence would be of a weld mesh paladin type and would provide inter-visibility. At a total height of 3m this is not considered to be overly oppressive, whilst the benefit to future residents of preventing ball entering their property must also be considered.

#### Highway safety

33. The site is located to the rear of 115-135 Greenside, Euxton and the proposal is for 36 dwellings comprising fourteen, 2-bed terraced houses, fourteen, 3-bed semi-detached houses and eight, 1-bed maisonettes. The standard off-street parking requirement in respect of the current proposal has been met and is in line with policy ST4 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026.
34. The proposed site layout involves extending the existing 5.5m wide stub access into the application site. The existing footways would also be extended alongside the carriageway to

the boundaries of Plot 18 on the west side and Plot 4 on the east side of the carriageway. From these points for the rest of the site access road, there would be no footways as the carriageway becomes a shared surface. It is noted that the applicants do not wish to offer the proposed layout for highway adoption, nonetheless, there is need for the design to be safe and accessible with suitable long-term management and maintenance arrangements in place. The design of the site access should be such that it does not affect the safety and efficient functioning of the highway or otherwise affect road users. To achieve these results, it is advisable for the layout to be designed as if it would be offered for adoption in accordance with the Lancashire County Council Specification for Construction of Estate Roads.

35. The section of Greenside leading to the site is currently only adopted from the main Greenside up to a point mid-way along the width of the back garden of 209 Greenside and measures approximately 44.0m in length from the centre of the main Greenside. From the end of the adoption to the end of the stub access, the existing carriageway and the footways are un-adopted and currently privately maintained.
36. The proposed number of parking spaces is acceptable as Greenside has no on-street prohibition of waiting or parking and the section of Greenside leading to the site has few frontages, thus allowing some parking to be accommodated on-street without highway safety being compromised.
37. It is noted that the proposal would result in the loss of the existing communal parking area to the rear of 133-135 Greenside. Many of the existing properties at Greenside do not benefit from private off street parking, and have no potential to do so given the pedestrianised layout of parts of the estate. As such residents rely on communal parking areas and on street parking. In this sense the loss of the communal parking area to the rear of 133-135 Greenside is regrettable and would result in residents having to park on-street. Although it is recognised that residents currently park on the parking area its retention cannot be controlled by Chorley Council or through the assessment of the planning application as the land is in private ownership and access could be removed at any time. As such the parking area cannot be protected in relation to an application for planning permission. In addition to this the land is allocated for housing development in the Local Plan as set out above.
38. As a result of the existing communal parking area being encompassed within the site boundary, the entrance to the parking area has become redundant and needs to be reinstated by extending the existing footway across to tie-in. As the car park access is within the adopted highway, the re-instatement together with the vehicle dropped crossings required to access Plots 1 and 2 would be carried out with the agreement of LCC with all costs borne by the applicant.

#### Ecology and trees

39. Due to the nature of the application site, the application is supported by an Ecological Survey and Assessment, as well as supplementary reports. These have been reviewed by the GMEU Ecologist. They advise that ecology surveys that have been undertaken by a licensed and experienced ecological consultancy whose work is known to the Ecology Unit. The ecological consultants appear to have undertaken a detailed survey of the site and carried out an appropriate level of survey.
40. The survey found the majority of the site to have limited ecological value, being amenity grassland. There is, however, an area of broadleaved plantation woodland in the south of the site and a number of mature trees of ecological value. The trees would be lost to the development and the Ecological Assessment states that "there will be a requirement to mitigate for the loss of these trees on site".
41. The proposed planting plan identifies that 28 heavy standard and extra heavy standard trees would be planted in addition to 7no. small specimen trees and a variety of hedges, shrubs and groundcover. It is, however, recognised that there is insufficient space to fully mitigate proposed tree losses by number, canopy area or associated qualities.

42. The applicants tree survey acknowledges the contribution that the trees make to the landscape by the attribution of 'Category B' quality status and subcategory '2', which is defined in BS 5837 as trees whose value is derived from 'Mainly Landscape Qualities'. The report concludes that they do not have the 'particular visual importance' required by BS 5837 to qualify them as Category A trees, nor do they have any greater amenity value than inherent to all trees, they are not exceptional in this respect. This assessment is not disputed.
43. It is noted that there are two mature oak trees to the north west of the site that are of some amenity value. These are identified as T11 and T12 within the applicant's tree survey. The trees were surveyed individually and afforded Category B,1,2 on the basis of imbalanced canopies, leaning stems and the presence of damage and wounding on T11. In this respect they lacked 'the special quality necessary to merit the Category A designation'. They were not considered 'particularly good examples of their species' or 'essential components of groups or formal or semi-formal arboricultural features', required by BS 5837 in order to attain Category A status. The trees are visible from public vantages either from the playing fields or at a height of 13m to the rear of an existing property. As such they are not particularly conspicuous and lack features that might otherwise elevate their conservation value to 'significant', and thus either Category A subcategories 2 or 3. This is not disputed.
44. The loss of the trees is regrettable as they do provide a level of public amenity and have biodiversity value. The whole of the site is, however, allocated for housing in the Local Plan and some provision is made for tree planting within the development by way of some mitigation. Although the loss of the trees cannot be fully mitigated against through replacement planting some balance must be struck between the need to deliver housing on what is an allocated housing site and any harmful impacts that may result, which in this case is through the loss of trees and their associated amenity and biodiversity value.
45. The applicant's Ecological Assessment makes a number of recommendations including:
- Production and implementation of a Non-Licensed Reasonable Avoidance Measures (RAMS) method statement for amphibians
  - Production and implementation of a method statement for tree removal works in relation to bats.
  - Timing of vegetation and tree removal in relation to nesting birds
46. It is recommended that these be incorporated into a Construction Environmental Management Plan for Biodiversity, and that the submission of this document be secured by condition prior to any development taking place.
47. In addition the assessment recommends that mitigation for the loss of bat roosting and bird nesting opportunities be provided together with biodiversity enhancement measures. It is, therefore, recommended that a scheme for the biodiversity mitigation and enhancement measures is secured by condition.

#### Drainage

48. The applicant has provided a surface water drainage statement with the planning submission. The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) have assessed the site in consideration of this strategy and are satisfied at this stage that the proposed development can be allowed in principle. The LLFA consider that the applicant will need to provide further information to ensure that the proposed development can go ahead without posing an unacceptable flood risk.
49. Under current guidance a hierarchical approach to surface water drainage and disposal is now required as follows-
1. Soakaways / infiltration
  2. Watercourse
  3. SW sewer
  4. CW sewer

50. Desk based research via Soilsclapes website indicates clayey soils across the application site. On this basis the use of infiltration techniques has been discounted on this site.
51. There is an existing watercourse to the south of the site, which the existing 300mm surface water sewer discharges into. The topography of the site is such that it falls naturally towards this watercourse. The watercourse is in 3rd party land and hence no automatic right of connection exists. However, on the basis that the existing 300mm surface water sewer connects directly to the watercourse it is therefore proposed to allow surface water to discharge to the diverted surface water sewer at Greenfield rates.
52. Flows would be restricted to equivalent "Greenfield" run off rates, with on-site attenuation for storms up to and including the 1% AEP + 30% climate change event.
53. Surface water run-off would be restricted to 5.0 litres/second for events up to the above return period. Surface water sewers connecting to the diverted Surface Water would be offered to United Utilities for adoption under a S104 Agreement as covered by the Water Industry Act 1991.
54. The proposed method of draining the development is in accordance with current guidance and best management practise and considered to be an acceptable means of foul and surface water disposal.

#### Affordable housing

55. Policy 7 of the Core Strategy requires 30% affordable housing to be provided on sites of 15 or more dwellings, or 0.5 hectares in size (which this is), in urban areas such as this. The proposed development would comprise entirely of dwellings that are affordable housing units consisting of 36 units for affordable rent. The scheme would be partially funded through a Homes England grant.
56. The Council requires at least 70% of affordable housing units to be for social rent or affordable rent as set out in the Affordable Housing SPD. The Council's preference is for social rent units, however, the SPD states that affordable rent will be accepted where there is a demonstrable link to a Homes England funded scheme or in exceptional circumstances where it is appropriate because of the particular location or type of housing proposed. The applicant states that Homes England funding has been secured and has provided evidence of this. On the basis that the development is a Homes England funded scheme consisting entirely of affordable housing types the proposed mix is considered acceptable given the benefit of such a scheme.
57. The Central Lancashire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2017) [SHMA] provides an assessment of the affordable housing needs within the area. The report identifies a net deficit of 146 affordable homes within Chorley per annum. Therefore, there is an established need for affordable housing within Chorley. The proposal of a wholly affordable scheme, providing 36 dwellings would therefore significantly contribute to this established need.
58. The provision of affordable housing as proposed would need to be secured through a s106 legal agreement, given the proposal to deliver affordable housing across the whole of the site would result in a benefit that outweighs the necessity to apply the preferred tenure mix set out in the SPD.

#### Sustainability

59. Policy 27 of the Core Strategy requires all new dwellings to be constructed to Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes or Level 6 if they are commenced from 1<sup>st</sup> January 2016. It also requires sites of five or more dwellings to have either additional building fabric insulation measures or reduce the carbon dioxide emissions of predicted energy use by at least 15% through decentralised, renewable or low carbon energy sources. The 2015 Deregulation Bill received Royal Assent on Thursday 26th March 2015, which effectively removes Code for Sustainable Homes. The Bill does include transitional provisions which include:

*“For the specific issue of energy performance, local planning authorities will continue to be able to set and apply policies in their Local Plans which require compliance with energy performance standards that exceed the energy requirements of Building Regulations until commencement of amendments to the Planning and Energy Act 2008 in the Deregulation Bill 2015. This is expected to happen alongside the introduction of zero carbon homes policy in late 2016. The government has stated that, from then, the energy performance requirements in Building Regulations will be set at a level equivalent to the (outgoing) Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4. Until the amendment is commenced, we would expect local planning authorities to take this statement of the government’s intention into account in applying existing policies and not set conditions with requirements above a Code Level 4 equivalent.”*

*“Where there is an existing plan policy which references the Code for Sustainable Homes, authorities may continue to apply a requirement for a water efficiency standard equivalent to the new national technical standard, or in the case of energy a standard consistent with the policy set out in the earlier paragraph in this statement, concerning energy performance.”*

60. Given this change, instead of meeting the code level, the dwellings should achieve a minimum dwelling emission rate of 19% above 2013 Building Regulations in accordance with the above provisions. This can be controlled by a condition.

#### Public open space

61. The proposed development would generate a requirement for the provision of public open space (POS) in line with policies HS4a and HS4b of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026 and the Open Space and Playing Pitch SPD, including for amenity greenspace, natural and semi natural greenspace and playing pitches.
62. In this particular case on site provision is not sought as it is not considered appropriate in this instance, given that the scheme would provide 100% affordable housing, is limited by the relatively small site area and is adjacent to playing fields to the west and public open space to the south. Any inclusion of on-site POS would result in the loss of affordable units, which would increase the liability for the provider and would ultimately affect the viability of the scheme, which is already marginal. Therefore it is considered that on balance the on-site provision of POS is not appropriate in this instance.
63. The applicant has agreed to make the contribution towards the off site provision of amenity greenspace and natural and semi natural greenspace. However, the applicant has submitted a viability appraisal setting out that no further contributions would be possible from the development. The scheme would be grant funded in part by Homes England, given that the whole site would be affordable housing.
64. It is clear that the viability of the site is a serious concern for the development. The Council’s independent viability assessor has scrutinised the viability appraisal and sought clarification on certain factors that have been used to calculate viability. These have been addressed in an updated viability appraisal, which continues to demonstrate marginal viability. It is, therefore, considered that a contribution towards the off site provision of amenity greenspace and natural and semi natural greenspace only is acceptable in this instance given the viability issues. This should be secured via a s106 agreement.

#### Employment skills provision

65. 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. The SPD seeks to;

- Increase employment opportunities by helping local businesses to improve, grow and take on more staff

- help businesses to find suitable staff and suppliers, especially local ones
- improve the skills of local people to enable them to take advantage of the resulting employment opportunities
- help businesses already located in Central Lancashire to grow and attract new businesses into the area

66. The SPD requires development over certain thresholds to be accompanied by an Employment and Skills Statement to ensure the right skills and employment opportunities are provided at the right time. This is to the benefit of both the developer and local population and covers the following areas:

- Creation of apprenticeships/new entrants/graduates/traineeships
- Recruitment through Job Hub and Jobcentre plus and other local employment vehicles.
- Work trials and interview guarantees
- Vocational training (NVQ)
- Work experience (14-16 years, 16-19 years and 19+ years) (5 working days minimum)
- Links with schools, colleges and university
- Use of local suppliers
- Supervisor Training
- Management and Leadership Training
- In house training schemes
- Construction Skills Certification Scheme (CSCS) Cards
- Support with transport, childcare and work equipment
- Community based projects

67. A condition is recommended requiring an employment and skills plan.

#### Education provision

68. Lancashire County Council (LCC) as Education Authority seeks to draw the Council's attention to impacts associated with the above development and propose mitigation for these impacts through a developer contribution. Based upon the latest assessment, taking into account all approved applications, LCC are seeking a contribution for 6 primary school places. However, LCC are not seeking a contribution for secondary school places.

69. Calculated at the current rates, this would result in a claim of:

Primary places:

$(£12,257 \times 0.97) \times \text{BCIS All-in Tender Price } (324 / 240) \text{ (Q1-2019/Q4-2008)}$

= £16,050.54 per place

$£16,050.54 \times 6 \text{ places} = £96,303.24$

70. The request for a contribution from LCC Education is noted, however this is an allocated site and education requests such as this are included within the scope of the Community Infrastructure Levy funds.

#### Community Infrastructure Levy

71. 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. It is anticipated, however, that an affordable housing exemption will be sought.

#### Other matters

72. Impact on property values and saleability of houses: there is no evidence to demonstrate that the proposed development would reduce house prices locally and this is not a material planning consideration in any event.

## **CONCLUSION**

73. The application is recommended for approval subject to conditions and a Section 106 agreement to secure affordable housing and a financial contribution towards the provision of public open space.

## **RELEVANT HISTORY OF THE SITE**

**Ref:** 81/00901/FUL      **Decision:** PERFPP      **Decision Date:** 1 December 1981  
**Description:** Extension to existing playing fields

**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

To follow.