

Item 11/00420/REMAJ

Case Officer Caron Taylor

Ward Chorley South West

Proposal Reserved Matters application for no. 63 two-storey dwellings (including 7 affordable units) and associated infrastructure (related to outline permission ref: 09/00665/OUTMAJ)

Location Bill Beaumont Textiles Park Mills Deighton Road Chorley Lancashire

Applicant Jones Homes Fylde

Consultation expiry: 4 July 2011

Application expiry: 18 August 2011

Consultation expiry date: 4 July 2011

Decision date: 18 August 2011

Proposal

1. The proposal is a reserved matters application for no. 63 two-storey dwellings (including 7 affordable units) and associated infrastructure (related to outline permission ref: 09/00665/OUTMAJ).
2. The site was granted outline planning permission (specifying access) for residential development in November 2009. The area of this outline application also included numbers 1 and 3 Deighton Road, however the current application excludes them from the site and proposes to keep these properties.
3. Although the outline application was approved with the parameters that some three storey properties were permitted within the site, however the current application proposes all the properties to be two-storey.

Recommendation

4. It is recommended that this application is granted planning approval subject to conditions and a Section 106 Agreement.

Main Issues

5. The main issues for consideration in respect of this planning application are:
 - Principle of the development
 - Housing Development
 - Density
 - Levels
 - Impact on the neighbours
 - Design
 - Open Space
 - Trees and Landscape
 - Ecology
 - Traffic and Transport

Representations

6. 6 letters of objection have been received and 1 letter of concern, on the following grounds:

- There will be additional traffic on Oakwood Road and Letchworth Grove. It is already difficult to cross Claremont Avenue corner and Collingwood Road, especially for elderly, young, disabled and partially sighted people at busy times;
- Commercial vehicles currently find it difficult to turn into Deighton Road. A pedestrian footway access to the estate will force vehicles to park fully on Deighton Road and make it difficult for emergency services and commercial vehicles to access Deighton Road;
- They are concerned the junction with Oakwood Road and Ventnor Road would become hazardous at peak times, 63 units will significantly increase the volume of traffic in this residential area;
- Parking – the terraced houses on Letchworth Drive have no driveways which necessitates parking on road and therefore it is single width; Deighton Road is double parked every night because of the overspill of cars;
- Plots 1 -3 seem to have only 4 parking spaces which does not seem sufficient to avoid parking on the road and/or pavement;
- Although there are two access points shown, Deighton Road will serve the vast majority of traffic;
- Access should be provided to the new development from Maud Street, Longworth Street, and Walletts Road, the latter to give easy access to Tootell Street. Letchworth drive should be avoided. Emergency Services would have difficulties if Deighton Road access was agreed;
- Please ensure the proposal would not create problems with drainage and sewerage disposal in the area;
- Bats are living in the old chimney;
- Houses are not selling so why do we need them;
- Another development in the area will smother them and diminish their feeling of well-being.
- The houses in Letchworth Drive have very small gardens which mean their property will be feet away from the development. The will be disturbance and noise from 63 dwellings with people and vehicles coming and going at all hours;
- No. 1 Deighton state they currently have a single storey office building to the rear of their property which is only used Monday to Friday 8.30am until 5pm. To replace this with two, two-storey, three bed units will make a big impact in terms of an increase of noise, disturbance and loss of privacy in comparison;
- One of the units will look directly into the garden of no. 1 Deighton Road;
- To place 7 affordable units on the estate will be out of character with the area. The Chorley Guardian recently report that another scheme was refused because there was enough affordable housing in Chorley for the next 5 years.
- Plot 45 will reduce light to their garden and the room facing it, it is too close. They are also concerned that plot 45 will have a side window in the side that would overlook them;
- They are concerned that there is no reference to an ecology or wildlife survey. The proposal may affect bats which are a protected species. The Council is obliged by law to fully assess the impact of a proposed development. Under a recent High court judgement the Council has a legal duty to determine whether the three 'degradation' tests of the Habitats Directive have been met when determining whether to grant planning permission for a development which could harm a European Protected Species;

- They are concerned that the site plan does not include trees adjacent to the site. There is a mature oak tree at the electrical substation on the corner of Oakwood Road/Ventnor Road approximately 12m from plots 52 and 53 that has not been included. There is also a young oak tree at the junction of the site with Oakwood Road which is approximately 10m from plot 45 which has not been identified. Both trees could influence the development due to their proximity. A tree survey should incorporate a tree constraints plan, tree retention and root protection plan.
- The number of sycamore trees being felled is a cause for concern;
- There is no Transport Statement, Transport Assessment or Travel Plan.

Consultations

The Environment Agency

7. Have no further comments to make than those made on the outline planning permission when they requested a condition in relation to ground contamination which was placed on the outline permission.

The Architectural Design and Crime Reduction Advisor

8. Has nothing further to add since the outline application when they stated they have searched the crime data and crime and anti-social behaviour in the area of the proposed site and it is not to be of particular concern. However, the alleyway at the rear of the development causes concern as a potential for future crime and disorder. However, this alleyway exists at present and is not in the ownership or control of the applicant.

Lancashire County Council (Archaeology)

9. Draw the Council's attention to information received by them since the submission of the original 2009 application to develop the site. Following the completion of the Lancashire Textile Mills Survey Stage 1, completed by Oxford Archaeology North in 2010, Park Mills is now recorded on the Lancashire Historic Environment Record as a non-designated heritage asset, PRN 34949. The textile mills of the North West are of great historical significance, shaping the landscape and communities in which they were built and which surrounded them, whilst evidence for past engineering and manufacturing is gradually decreasing throughout the County. Where demolition is proposed Lancashire County Archaeology Service would recommend that an archaeological record, comprising plans, drawings and photographs, should be made of the buildings. Lancashire County Archaeology Service would therefore recommend that the above work be secured by means of a condition.

Chorley's Conservation Officer

10. Advises that they are aware of the mills survey work undertaken by Oxford Archaeology (North), sponsored by LCC and English Heritage which, although undertaken over a period of years, was only completed relatively recently – which is probably why no such condition was suggested at the outline stage. At that time LCC would simply have not been aware of the existence of the mill as a potential heritage asset.
11. Mill buildings are a vital part of our industrial heritage, and are very under-represented on either national, regional or local historic environment records. Indeed Chorley, a town once full of mills and associated buildings, has seen many of these iconic structures demolished in increasing numbers since the latter quarter of the 20th Century. The result is that very few of these mill complexes remain in Chorley. They are the focus of this years English Heritage 'Heritage at Risk' programme. The Conservation Officer reports that the building is in largely its original condition with even the mill chimney being intact. The characteristic north-light roof, a typical feature of these buildings was designed to allow for the best and most even

natural light by which to work to be used is still in place. The need to record the historic environment is supported by Policy HE12 of PPS5, which particularly stresses the need where demolition is proposed and the heritage asset is to be lost forever.

12. The Conservation Officer therefore supports the request by Lancashire County Council for an Archaeological Record to be made of the building before it is demolished. He suggests a Level 3 record is required in accordance with English Heritage Guidance, 'Understanding Historic Buildings: A guide to good recording practice' to include a measured survey, photographic record and written account based upon historical research.

United Utilities

13. Have no objection to the proposal provided that the site is drained on a separate system, with only foul drainage connected into the foul sewer. Surface water should discharge to the soakaway/watercourse/surface water sewer and may require the consent of the Environment Agency. If surface water is allowed to be discharged to the public surface water sewerage system we may require the flow to be attenuated to a maximum discharge rate determined by United Utilities.

Lancashire County Council (Highways)

14. See traffic and transport section of this report.

Chorley's Waste & Contaminated Land Officer

15. Notes that the outline planning permission contained a condition in relation to a ground contamination and state that they will review the information submitted as part of a discharge of conditions application.

Chorley's Arboricultural Officer

16. States that the supplied tree report seems to be at odds with the proposed layout. The report suggests that the majority of the trees under the TPO are worth retention (a conclusion they agree with) while the layout plan shows almost all of them being removed.
17. They can see no arboricultural reason for this and it seems in direct contradiction of item 15 of the Planning Statement for the development, which states that all the trees along the Southern boundary are to be protected by fencing. This suggests retention.
18. The only reason they can think of for the developer to desire removal of these trees is that as they are on the South side there will be shading of the gardens and properties. If the works proposed by the arboricultural report of Mr Tavendale were to be undertaken, this could be alleviated considerably due to the removal of the poor specimens and the pruning of the remaining ones to give a better shape.
19. However, in its present form they have grave concerns regarding the future of the trees surrounding this site (see tree section of this report for an update).

Chorley Strategic Housing

20. The site is in a popular residential area .The proposed house types are attractive externally and each type has a good internal layout. According to the draft s.106 agreement the affordable units are to be split , in terms of house type, as follows – 5 x 2 bed houses and 2 x 3 bed houses. In terms of tenure the proposed split is 5 x social rented homes and 2 x 'intermediate' i.e affordable sale/shared ownership. The need for this type of accommodation is supported by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2009.

Assessment

Principle of the development

21. The principle of the site for residential development has already been established by the outline permission which also approved the two access points. This application is therefore only concerned with the remaining matters of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.

Density

22. The site area is approximately 1.4 hectares and so the development equates to approximately 43 dwellings per hectare. The density of the site is considered in keeping with the surrounding area, which is made up of a variety of properties but includes terraced properties, notably on Letchworth Drive, Ventnor Road and Walleys Road.

Layout and Design

23. The main entrance to the site will be via Deighton Road and the layout has been designed so that the internal road splits on entering the site with properties positioned at the head of the vista created, with plots 1, 2 and 61 facing onto Deighton Road as the site is approached. Within the site once the entrance road has split, one spur will continue through to the second access onto Oakwood Road (with a cul-de-sac off it) and the other will create a cul-de-sac with turning head. The properties will all face onto the main street frontages with parking provided in either side driveways or parking spaces in front of the properties, apart from plots 57 to 60 and plots 62 and 63 that will have two spaces each in a rear parking courtyard.
24. The properties will be a mixture of semi-detached and terraced blocks, all two-storey, some with front canopies, others with porches and bay windows.
25. Although many of the properties are terraced in layout, they have access ways to allow bins to be brought to the front of the property on collection day to avoid bins needing to be stored at the front of properties or the need for the creation of rear alley ways.
26. The design and layout is considered acceptable in relation to Policy HS4. There are a wide range of properties in the area, including the newer properties (permitted in the early 1990s) on Oakwood Close. In addition the layout of the properties ensures that as the site is entered an attractive entrance feature is created.

Levels

27. The site is relatively flat but there is a general slope from east to west with the lowest part of the site being in the north corner to the rear of the properties Letchworth Drive (numbers 43 – 55). The highest and lowest parts of the site have a difference of approximately 2.75m.

Impact on the neighbours

28. The site is surrounded by residential properties.
29. The properties on Letchworth Drive and some of those on Collingwood Road are at a slightly lower level than the site, however cross-sections have been received by the case officer and there will not be more than 0.35m difference in the levels of the existing and proposed properties so the Council's normal interface distances do not need to be increased. These properties are also separated from the site by an existing alleyway. The proposed layout meets the interface distances for the all the properties (numbers 31 to 55) on Letchworth Drive and Collingwood Road (numbers 48 to 34). Number 30 Collingwood Road is one of a

pair of two-storey semi-detached properties. Although there will only be 11m between the rear windows of this property and the side wall of the property proposed on plot 9 of the development (as opposed to 12m required by the Council's interface distances) this property currently faces the wall of the existing textile mill and its north light roof which has an interface distance of only 7m with this property. Therefore it is considered that the proposal will improve the outlook from this property and increase the interface distance from what currently exists.

30. The properties on Pembroke Place are also semi-detached two-storey houses. The rear wall of the mill forms the rear boundary of number 24 Pembroke Place and number 28 Collingwood Road. The proposed properties on plots 9 to 12 meet the guideline of 10m to the boundary, but fall slightly short of 21m between facing window guideline at 18m with numbers 22 and 24 Pembroke Place. However, it is also considered that removal of the mill building will improve the amenities of these properties above what exists even though it falls slightly short of the guideline. The applicant advises that they have spoken to neighbours who's property boundary is the mill wall and agreed that they will retain the wall but lower it in height so that it is the same as the wall which runs behind nos. 22-16 Pembroke Place (the rear boundary wall behind these houses is freestanding and does not form part of the Mill so it can be left untouched). The gable wall of lot 13 meets the interface distance with number 18 Pembroke Place.
31. The properties at the end of the cul-de-sac on Pembroke Place are at an angle with the proposed properties plots (28 – 33) and therefore although the existing properties have relatively short gardens the windows will not directly face each other. The interface guideline of 10m between the first floor windows and the boundary with the existing properties is met.
32. The properties on Walleys Road do not directly back onto the application site as they have garden areas separated by a rear alley way from the properties themselves. The interface distances with all these properties is therefore met or exceeded.
33. The properties on Oakwood Road that will back onto the site are newer semi-detached properties, some of which have garages in their rear gardens. They are at an angle with the site boundary. Amended plans have been received by the case officer changing the layout of the proposed site in this area as it was considered the original proposal would not comply with the interface guidelines, particularly in relation to number 28 Oakwood Road. Number 28 now looks towards a rear gable the distance of which exceeds the interface distance of 12m at 14m. Numbers 24/26 Oakwood Close look onto a parking area and 20/22 onto rear gardens. Plots 43 and 44 face towards these properties and meet the interface distance of 10m to a boundary. Although the facing window distance of 21m is not met (at the closest point being 17m) as the properties on Oakwood Close are at an angle with the site boundary the windows of the properties will not directly face each other and this relationship is therefore considered acceptable. Plots 52 and 53 will face onto and be accessed from Oakwood Road but will face towards an existing electricity substation rather than another property.
34. Number 18 Oakwood Close is a detached property and is at an angle with the site boundary. This property will face towards the side gable of the proposed property on plot 45 of the development. Although it has a rear conservatory its main habitable room windows (serving a dining room at ground floor and bedroom at first floor) are on its the side elevation (facing northwest) rather than on the rear elevation. At first floor on the rear elevation are only two obscure glazed bathroom windows. There is a rear kitchen window at ground floor and the conservatory, however given the angle of the property with the proposed property on plot 45

this relationship is considered acceptable, subject to a condition preventing the insertion of windows in its gable end.

35. Plots 54 to 56 will face towards no. 16 Oakwood Close but meet the 10m to a boundary interface distance. Plots 57 to 60 bound with their parking area to the rear and no. 60 meets the interface distance to the side boundary with no. 3 Deighton Road. The property on plot 61 is orientated so its main elevation faces onto Deighton Road and the applicants have confirmed the house type will be handed on this plot so that there is only a bathroom window in the side elevation facing towards the side boundary of number 3 Deighton Road.
36. Plots 62 and 63 are to be a pair of semi-detached properties situated in a small rear court off the main road running through the development to the rear of plots 56 to 61. They meet the interface distance with the properties on Letchworth Drive. They will be served by two tandem spaces to the side of the pair which allow the interface distance of 12m between a window and a gable wall to be met in relation to number 3 Deighton Road. The properties will be at right angles to number 1 Deighton Road and therefore this relationship is considered acceptable.
37. Overall the relationship of the site with the neighbouring properties is considered acceptable in terms of policy HS4 subject to conditions controlling the insertion of additional windows and obscure glazing.

Open Space

38. The outline permission secured payments for open space through a section 106 legal agreement, however at that time the payments were reduced proportionally as the developed proposed to provide 303m² on site amenity open space and this was also written into the s106 agreement. The 303m² required to be provided has been secured in the reserved matters layout to the rear of plots 50 and 51. The rear boundary of these properties is proposed as a part brick, part close boarded fence with landscaping in front to improve the visual amenity of this area but also to discourage children kicking balls against people's boundaries causing damage to them.

Trees and Landscape

39. There are a number of protected trees on the site covered by Tree Preservation Order 7 (Chorley) 2009. They are all on the southern boundary with the site apart from a Hawthorn on Oakwood Road adjacent to number 16.
40. A tree report accompanies the application. Initially the developer proposed to fell all the protected trees apart from four in the southern corner, however this did not match the recommendations of the tree report. The Council's tree officer advised that he could see no arboricultural reason for removing them, other than that they are on the South side there will be shading of the gardens and properties. He advised that if the works proposed by the tree report submitted with the were to be undertaken, the amount of shading could be alleviated considerably due to the removal of the poor specimens and the pruning of the remaining ones to give a better shape.
41. Discussions were entered into with the applicants and amended plans have now been received showing which trees are to be retained in line with the recommendations of the tree report (this report did recommend felling of a number of trees which is accepted by the Council's tree officer). The tree officer has reviewed the amended scheme and advises that it is good to see that the plan is being re-jigged to allow for the retention, [especially] of trees TS3 and TS4.

42. Of the group of trees by the access to Oakwood road only one is covered the Tree Preservation Order which the tree officer advises is because they have been topped in the past. The Hawthorn has also been cut but has recovered well and has developed a nice canopy and therefore this was protected. The tree officer advises Hawthorns are incredibly tough and they would like to see it be given a chance if possible, even if it means going into the Root Protection Area to fit everything in the corner. The amended plans show the Hawthorn to be retained.
43. A neighbour has expressed concerns for the Oaks across the road by the substation, however the tree officer has been consulted on that and advises they should be unaffected by the development as any Root Protection Areas for these trees would stop in the middle of the road, well before the site.
44. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in relation to trees with regard to Policy EP9 Although some are to be felled the Council's tree officer agrees with reasons for this.

Ecology

45. The issue of protected species was considered at the outline stage as the proposal would involve demolition of the existing mill building. The outline application was accompanied by a bat survey report, which the County Ecologist reviewed and did not object to the scheme subject to appropriate conditions. As this is a reserved matters application (rather than a full application) the developer will still be tied to the conditions of the outline permission in relation to ecology.

Traffic and Transport

46. The principle of the development and the access points have already been approved by the outline permission. The reserved matters application is therefore concerned with the internal layout of the site in terms of traffic and transport.
47. The outline application secured funding through the S106 Agreement for a Puffin Crossing at Collingwood Road and its junction with Letchworth Drive.
48. Lancashire County Council Highways initially made a number of comments on the original plans for this application. Although they considered the main access road linking Deighton Road with Oakwood Road and the corner radii at Oakwood Rd and the two new access roads to be satisfactory, they commented that the two internal access roads had been designed as shared vehicle and pedestrian access with services strips on both side and no formal footways, however there was no physical definition of the change in character of the space. The surface of an access road should normally have a varying width to aid informality. In addition they commented that it must be 4.5m wide at the entrance, with wider areas arranged in suitable positions to accommodate the occasional waiting/passing large vehicle (refuge wagon etc) and there should also be widening of the road at bends, or the whole access road made 4.8m width throughout. In addition there should also be rumble area (change of surface material) at the entrance. Amended plans have been received providing a rumble strip at the entrance both access roads and they have both been widened to 4.8m throughout.
49. LCC Highways also stated that a 2.0m wide service strip should normally be provided on both sides of the road but this may be reduced to 0.5m wide on only one side of the road providing there is no development or 0.8m wide if street lighting columns are present. The amended plans now show the 2m service strip where required.

50. Highways also commented that the 'alley' type of access arrangement between plots 58 and 59 adjacent should be discouraged unless supported by a separate footway as they provide poor access for pedestrians and also put pedestrians in direct conflict with vehicles. They state that ideally they would like to see 2.0m wide footways on both sides of the drive however they are not unsure how much they can insist on this. Otherwise the access drive should be widened to 6m, and the two gates with direct access onto the drive relocating away from this area. The amended plans although not widened the access way to 6m now show a footway along the 'alley' type access for pedestrians. The gates have been relocated so pedestrians will not step straight into the path of a vehicle. A raised table has also been added at the junction with the access between plots 58 and 59 to slow vehicles as there may be cars coming out of this access and it is now considered acceptable.
51. In terms of parking, objectors raise this as an issue in the area, as many existing properties have no off road parking and therefore currently park on Deighton Road. The applications scheme cannot be made to solve the existing parking issues, but it should not add to those issues and therefore it is considered that although the site is in a sustainable location to the Council's normal parking standards of two spaces for a two and three bedroom property should be applied to the site with no relaxation. LCC Highways also advise that each dwelling should have two parking spaces each to discourage on-street parking and any garages should be sized 6m long by 3m wide internally. They also comment on the required sizes of driveways.
52. All the proposed properties will have either two or three bedrooms apart from the two detached dwellings on plots 62 and 63 which will have four bedrooms. The original plans only showed ten parking spaces for the six dwellings on plots 57-60 and plots 62 and 63 and this is a slight under provision of car parking. In addition, Plots 57 and 60 did not have rear garden gates enabling direct access to the dwellings from the parking area. Highways were concerned that the inconvenience of parking to the rear with no direct access via the back garden area together with a shortfall in the number of parking spaces would inevitably lead to and encourage on-street parking on the main road outside and this would be likely to obstruct access in and out at the private drive, and obstruct ease of manoeuvring at parking spaces to Plots 20 & 21.
53. The amended plans now provide the required two parking spaces for every dwelling, except the two, four bed properties that have two spaces and in addition a single garage. This is in line with the Council's parking standards. Rear access gates have also been provided for those properties that will have spaces in the rear parking court to encourage people to park there rather than on the road in front of their properties.
54. To conclude traffic and transport, the principle of the site for residential development has already been established by the outline permission as have the two access points on Deighton Road and Oakwood Close. It is considered that the amended plans have overcome the concerns of Lancashire County Highways in terms of the internal layout and parking at the site.

Section 106 Agreement

55. The outline application had a s106 agreement attached to secure the affordable housing on the site, the commuted sum towards open space, the required 303m² of open space to be provided on site and the cost of a puffin crossing. This reserved matters application would still be bound by the original s106 however a number of typographical errors were found in

the document and therefore a new s106 has been drawn up, still securing the same items as above but a clean version. The application is recommended subject to this being signed.

Other Matters

56. To respond to some of the objections raised that have not already been covered by the report:
57. An objector states that access should be provided to the new development from Maud Street, Longworth Street, and Walleys Road, the latter to give easy access to Tootell Street and Letchworth drive should be avoided. Emergency Services would have difficulties if Deighton Road access was agreed. The two access points to the site via Deighton Road and Oakwood Road have been approved by the outline permission.
58. In terms of drainage and sewerage disposal in the area, United Utilities and the Environment Agency were consulted on the residential development of this site at the outline stage and had no objection to it. They were reconsulted on this application and the Environment Agency makes no further comments and United Utilities requests that the site be drained on a separate system, a condition to this effect was applied at the outline stage.
59. In relation to affordable units, the developer is required as part of the s106 for the outline to provide affordable units on this site.
60. To further respond to the matter of ecology raised by a neighbour, ecology was considered at outline stage. The neighbour refers to a High Court judgement, but the latest case is the Morge case that went to the Supreme Court. Before the Morge case the Council had to consider the three tests in determining all planning application, however the Morge case has subtly changed this. Although the Council still have to have regard to the three tests, an application shouldn't be refused unless it is considered that the scheme would not be licensable by Natural England. The County Ecologist did not object to that application subject to mitigation measures being secured via condition, which they were at outline stage and therefore the Council have no reason to believe it wouldn't get a licence.

Other Matters

Sustainability

61. Conditions in relation to the Council's Sustainable Resources Policy SR1 were applied to the outline permission. The applicant states that the dwellings will be built to Code Level 3 as required by policy SR1 which will be conditioned as part of this application.
62. Policy SR1 also requires developments to achieve a 15% reduction in carbon emissions via decentralised, renewable or low carbon energy sources. However, the applicant states that they can achieve a 25% reduction in carbon emissions without the need for any renewable energy sources. As a greater saving is being achieved than the 15% required, then this may be a material consideration that would outweigh the normal policy as a greater saving than the policy requires is being achieved. The applicant has been asked for further information on the way this 25% reduction will be achieved, so that if it is acceptable it can be conditioned. Sustainable resources will therefore be covered on the addendum.

Archaeology

63. The applicant has been advised of the comments of LCC Archaeology and the Council's Conservation Officer and advises an archaeological survey is to be undertaken before committee. This will be covered on the addendum.

Overall Conclusion

64. The reserved matters application is considered acceptable and is recommended for approval subject to conditions and a s106 agreement.

Planning Policies

National Planning Policies:

PPS1, PPS3, PPS9, PPG13, PPS23.

Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review

Policies: GN1, GN5, GN9, EP4, EP9, HS4, HS5, HS21, TR4

Chorley's Local Development Framework

- Policy SR1: Incorporating Sustainable Resources into New Development
- Sustainable Resources Development Plan Document
- Sustainable Resources Supplementary Planning Document

Planning History

09/00665/OUTMAJ- Outline application for residential development (specifying access). Permitted. November 2009.

Recommendation: Permit (Subject to Legal Agreement)

Conditions

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

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall only be carried out in conformity with the proposed ground and finished floor levels shown on approved plan (10-011 AL001 Rev L).

Reason: To protect the appearance of the locality and in the interests of the amenities of local residents and in accordance with Policy Nos. GN5 and HS4 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.

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

Drawing ref:	Title:	Date:
10-011 AL01 Rev L	Proposed Site Layout	27 June 2011
10-011 HT01	Calder Proposed Floor Plans & Elevations	16 May 2011
10-011 HT02	Langley 3 Proposed Floor Plans & Elevations	16 May 2011
10-011 HT03 Rev A	Langley Proposed Floor Plans & Elevations	16 May 2011
10-011 HT04	Sutton Proposed Floor Plans & Elevations	16 May 2011
10-011 HT05	Marton Proposed Floor Plans & Elevations	16 May 2011
10-011 HT07 Rev A	Birch/Cedar/Maple/Birch Proposed Elevations	16 May 2011
10-011 HT06 Rev A	Birch/Cedar/Maple/Birch Proposed Floor Plans	16 May 2011
10-011 SC01	Proposed Street Scenes Plots 1-3	16 May 2011
10-011 SC02	Proposed Street Scenes Plots 4-6 & Plots 7-8	16 May 2011
10-011 SC03	Proposed Street Scenes Plots 9-12	16 May 2011

10-011 SC04	Proposed Street Scenes Plots 13-16	16 May 2011
10-011 SC05	Proposed Street Scenes Plots 17-18, 54-55, Plots 19-20, 29-30	16 May 2011
10-011 SC06	Proposed Street Scenes Plots 31-33	16 May 2011
10-011 SC07	Proposed Street Scenes Plots 34-37	16 May 2011
10-011 SC08	Proposed Street Scenes Plots 45-50	16 May 2011
10-011 SC9	Proposed Street Scenes Plot 51	16 May 2011
10-011 SC10	Proposed Street Scenes Plots 56-58, 59-61	16 May 2011
10-011 SC11	Proposed Street Scenes Plots 62-63	16 May 2011
10-011 SS01	Proposed Site Section	8 June 2011
OS01	OS Plan	16 May 2011

Survey Details for Trees at Deighton Road, Chorley Dated 18 April 2011

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