

COMMITTEE REPORT

REPORT OF	MEETING	DATE	ITEM NO
Corporate Director (Business)	Development Control Committee	16/09/08	

ADDENDUM

Item A.1: 08/00728/FULMAJ - Demolition of existing bungalow, workshop and garage and erection of 10 No. two bed apartments

Additional letters have been received from 8 neighbours (including 3 from the same property), the contents of which can be summarised as follows: -

- The level of the housing should be the same
- Development will impact on privacy and light and increase noise
- Rural character of village will be harmed
- Additional traffic will lead to increased risk of accident
- Are the fire brigade happy that sufficient access can be gained
- Is drainage and sanitation sufficient into the existing systems which are believed to be borderline at the moment
- The development is not in accordance with the village plan and there are still issues with the design and scale of the development
- Levels issue not addressed
- Entrance is out of scale with road it opens onto
- Ecological surveys not fully addressed the issues
- Flats are too close to existing homes
- Urban style flats are unsympathetic to local area
- The plans show the loss of the pavement where the access comes out onto Tarnbeck Drive, putting pedestrians, especially children at risk
- The visibility splay will harm the streetscene
- No mention of how the developer will overcome the Grampian condition
- No fencing details supplied
- Development will lead to additional traffic
- More levels and landscaping details needed
- Issue regarding loss of privacy not addressed

All of the matters raised in these additional representations have already been addressed in the main report and levels, fencing and landscaping are the subject of pre-commencement conditions. Also, as already stated in the main report, LCC (Ecology) are now satisfied with the proposed mitigation measures and new Great Crested Newt Hibernacula at the southern end of the site.

In response to the amended plans, United Utilities raise no objections subject to the site being drained on a separate system with only foul drainage connected to the foul sewer. The following additional condition is therefore recommended: -

Surface water must drain separate from the foul and no surface water will be permitted to discharge to the foul sewerage system. If it is proposed that surface water is to be discharged to the public surface water sewerage system, full details of the surface water drainage system including flow discharge rate shall first be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in liaison with United Utilities. The surface water drainage system shall thereafter only be implemented in accordance with the approved details and maximum discharge rate specified by United Utilities.

Reason: To secure proper drainage and in accordance with Policy No. EP17 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.

The *Grampian* condition covering the visibility splay has been the subject of a minor change with the word 'provided' replaced with 'constructed'. The amended condition reads as follows: -

The development hereby permitted shall not commence until control of the land upon which the visibility splay detailed on the approved site plan (DRWG No. 07/170/P01 REV E) is to be provided has been secured by the applicant, evidence to confirm this has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the visibility splay has been constructed in accordance with the said site plan.

Reasons: In the interests of highway safety and in accordance with Policy No. TR4 of the Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.

The recommendation to approve this application therefore remains, as per the report in the agenda.

Item A.3: 08/00890/FULMAJ – Amendment to site layout and substitution of house types on plots 86-95 approved under application 06/00991/FULMAJ

Since the report was written comments have now been received from County Highways. They have raised objections on the following grounds:

- Individual garages of minimum dimensions of 6x3m count as one parking space, garages smaller than this do not count as a parking space;
- A standard size garage is considered capable of accommodating two cycle spaces, the provision of alternative cycle storage does not mean the minimum garage size of 6x3m can be reduced as a garage smaller than this is not considered suitable for use as a parking space;
- All drives fronting garages to be 6m long, this must not include any of the required 2m wide service verge;
- The sightlines from the new drive onto the footway to be 2.4x3.3m, measured from the centre of the drive.

All the garages in the three house types proposed are smaller than 6x3m. However, it is not considered that it would be reasonable to refuse the application or ask the applicant to amend the proposal on these grounds. These house types have been approved elsewhere on the site with no objections from Highways and even if the garages are discounted as parking spaces, the current proposal still represents a significant improvement in parking provision compared to the previously approved scheme under 06/00991/FULMAJ. All the driveway lengths proposed are now 6m long.

The recommendation to approve this application therefore remains, as per the report in the agenda.