

C O M M I T T E E R E P O R T		
REPORT OF	MEETING	DATE
Director (Customer and Digital)	Planning Committee	6 October 2020

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

**ITEM 3d - 20/00848/FUL – Hallsworth Manor, Long Lane, Heath Charnock**

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

Additional representations have been received from 5 of the individuals who have already made comments objecting to the proposed development. The only comment that differs from those already listed at paragraph 6 of the committee report is of dog walkers using the field outside of the stated hours of operation.

An additional representation has been received from one of the individuals who had already made comments in support of the proposed development. The individual runs dog training classes at the application site and notes amongst other things that many of the assertions from objectors are misleading. He states that *‘in one comment it is asserted that I use a megaphone system. In reality I used a mini portable microphone on 2 occasions back in spring and stopped because it was entirely unnecessary with such small groups.’* He also states that everything is done to reduce noise and disturbance and he would be willing to have noise survey taken at one of the classes *‘but that may be a challenge as the permanent hum of the M6 motorway would take precedence.’*

Comments in support of the proposal at paragraph 7 of the committee report should also include improved mental and physical health and wellbeing of dogs and their owners from using the facility.

The applicant has recently appointed a planning agent who has provided a letter in support of the proposal following a review of the committee report. The letter is provided in full at Appendix A to this addendum. Whilst the comments within the letter are noted, the officer recommendation remains as per the original report. A response to some of the agent’s comments is provided below:

- The letter mentions paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that *‘LPA’s should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation....’* It is noted that there are some positive aspects to the development in the form of outdoor activities and the impact this can have on the physical and mental health of its users. This however must be balanced against the harm that is caused by the proposal in terms of noise and disturbance to neighbouring residents which clearly outweighs any positive aspects of the development.

The applicant has provided a parking plan and site photographs in an attempt to overcome the concerns from LCC Highways with regards to safe parking and access

arrangements. It is worth noting however that these are not reasons for refusal of the planning application and could be overcome by planning conditions.

The applicant has requested that the decision on the outcome of the planning application be deferred to allow her time to respond to consultee and objector comments in detail and attempt to overcome the recommended reason for refusal. The applicant would also like committee members to visit the application site before coming to a decision on the outcome of the application.