

Item 4c	14/00096/OUT
Case Officer	Caron Taylor
Ward	Chisnall
Proposal	Outline application for a new detached house (with all matters reserved)
Location	Land Between Rose Cottage And York House Mill Lane Charnock Richard
Applicant	Heaton Family Trust-c/o RT Design

Consultation expiry: 6 March 2014

Application expiry: 2 April 2014

Proposal

1. Outline application for a new detached house (with all matters reserved)
2. The application is being reported to Committee as an elected Member of the Council, Cllr Heaton, has an involvement with the application.
3. The application is made in outline with all matters reserved.

Recommendation

4. It is recommended that this application is refused.

Main Issues

5. The main issues for consideration in respect of this planning application are:
 - Background information
 - Principle of the development
 - Design and layout
 - Impact on the neighbours
 - Open Space
 - Trees and Landscape
 - Flood Risk
 - Traffic and Transport
 - Drainage and Sewers
 - Sustainability

Representations

6. No representations have been received.
7. Charnock Richard Parish Council
The Parish Council has no objections provided the proposals meet all relevant planning criteria for development in Green Belt.

Consultations

8. **Lancashire County Council Highways**
Have no objections to the proposal in principle; however approval of the detailed proposal would depend on the design being in line with the Manual for Streets (MfS) in terms of access geometry, visibility requirements, access gradients, turning areas, internal layout etc. Car parking should also comply with the Chorley Council Parking Standard i.e. 2 spaces in respect of the proposed 3 bedroomed dwelling. The proposed integral garage is acceptable and should be 6m long and 3m wide. However, from the indicative plan, it is not clear where the second

parking space is to be located, given that the available space shown would be used for turning of vehicles. The first 5m of the proposed access from the back of footway will be required to be 'hard' paved to prevent loosed materials being carried onto the highway and any proposed gates shall open away from the highway for safety reasons. They suggest conditions if the application is approved.

United Utilities

9. Have no objection to the proposal.

10. Chorley Council Planning Policy

Emerging Local Plan Policy HS7 covers Rural Infilling which states;

Within smaller villages limited infilling for housing will be permitted providing the applicant can demonstrate that the following criteria are met:

- a) The existing buildings form a clearly identifiable built-up frontage;*
- b) The site lies within the frontage, with buildings on either side, and its development does not extend the frontage;*
- c) The proposal would complement the character and setting of the existing buildings.*

Infill is the filling of a small gap in an otherwise built-up street frontage, e.g. typically a gap which could be filled by one or possibly two houses of a type in keeping with the character of the street frontage.

When assessing applications for rural infill sites, the Council will also have regard to site sustainability, including access to public transport, schools, businesses and local services and facilities.

11. Limited infilling in scattered clusters of rural dwellings in the Green Belt is regarded as inappropriate development. This site lies within a group of only three properties and is therefore not considered to be a built up frontage, the site is also not within a village and is therefore not in accordance with Policy HS7.
12. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) only allows limited infilling in villages or previously developed sites in the Green Belt. As this site is not located within a village and not previously developed, the proposal is also not in accordance with the Framework.

Assessment

Background Information

13. Outline permission for a dwelling was refused under application 12/01148/OUT in February 2013 for the following reason:

14. *The proposed dwelling would be located within the Green Belt as defined by the Chorley Borough Local Plan Review. The location of the proposed development does not represent a previously developed site or fall within a substantial built up frontage. As such, the proposal represents inappropriate development in the greenbelt contrary to policy No. DC4 of the Chorley Borough Local Plan Review and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).*

15. The proposal was therefore refused having regard to Policy DC4 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review 2003.

Principle of the development

16. Since the previous refusal the emerging Local Plan 2012-2016 has now reached an advance stage and significant weight can now be given to its policies (other than issues surrounding Gypsies and Travellers which remain unresolved). Policy HS7 of the emerging Local Plan covers Rural Infilling and it is considered it now carries more weight than Local Plan Policy DC4.

17. Policy HS7 covers rural infilling and is detailed above. The issue to consider is whether the proposal is acceptable under policy HS7 as opposed to Policy DC4 that the previous application was refused on.

18. It is not considered that the application site is an infill plot under the emerging Local Plan policy. The site is not in a village, and it does not form part of an identifiable built-up frontage. Although there is one dwelling either side of the site and there is an outbuilding belonging to Whittle Bar Cottage adjacent to York House, Whittle Bar Cottage itself fronts onto the A49 Preston Road. It is not considered there are enough properties in the group for it to be classed as a built-up street frontage, but rather the properties are three isolated dwellings.
19. Therefore it is not considered that the emerging Local Plan policy HS7 allows a different recommendation to be made on this application on the previous application under Policy GC4 of the 2003 Local Plan. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to policy HS7.
20. In terms of national policy the Framework only allows limited infilling in villages or previously developed sites in the Green Belt. This site is not located within a village and not previously developed, the proposal is therefore considered contrary to the Framework.

Design and layout

21. The application is only made in outline with all matters reserved, however it is considered that a suitable designed dwelling could be accommodated on the site.
22. The site is relatively flat and it is considered that suitable levels could be achieved for a dwelling on the site.

Impact on the neighbours

23. Although the layout and appearance of the dwelling is not provided, indicative plans show how a dwelling may be placed on the site. There are two neighbouring properties, Rose Cottage and York House.
24. Rose Cottage is set at a slight angle to the road away from the application site and has no windows in its east gable facing the site. York House is sited further away from the application boundary and has a detached garage forward of its front elevation close to the boundary with the application site. This property has two windows in its ground floor (west) elevation facing towards the site, one of these being a set of patio doors, however these are 13m from the boundary and this is considered an acceptable relationship with the application site.
25. It is therefore considered that a dwelling could be located on the site without have an unacceptable impact on the neighbouring properties.

Open Space

26. If the development had proved acceptable in principle there would have been a requirement for a commuted sum payment of £1,888 towards public open space.

Trees and Landscape

27. There are not trees on the site and suitable landscaping could be controlled by a condition.

Flood Risk

28. The site is not located in Flood Zone 2 or 3 as identified by the Environment Agency and therefore a Flood Risk Assessment is not required.

Traffic and Transport

29. The indicative layout shows that at least two cars could be parked off road and it is therefore considered suitable parking in line with the Council's parking standards set out in policy ST4 of the emerging Local Plan could be achieved on the site.

Drainage and Sewers

30. It is considered suitable foul and surface water drainage could be achieved at the site and controlled via conditions.

Sustainability

31. A dwelling on the site would be required to meet Code Level 4 (at present) rising to Code Level 6 (from 1st January 2016) as required by Policy 27 of the Core Strategy and this could be controlled by conditions.

Overall Conclusion

32. The application is considered unacceptable in principle contrary to both the Framework and Policy HS7 of the emerging Local Plan. It is therefore recommended for refusal.

Planning Policies

National Planning Policies:

The National Planning Policy Framework

Joint Core Strategy

Policies 1, 17 and 27

Emerging Local Plan

ST4

Planning History

12/01148/OUT New Detached House. Refused 6th February 2013.

Recommendation: Refuse Full Planning Permission

Reasons

1. The proposal would be located in the Green Belt. The site is not an infill plot as defined by the National Planning Policy Framework or emerging Local Plan policy HS7, as it is not in a village and it does not form part of an identifiable built-up frontage. As such, the proposal represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt contrary to policy No. HS7 of the emerging Local Plan 2012-2016 and the National Planning Policy Framework.