

Item 3d **14/00791/FUL**

Case Officer **David Stirzaker**

Ward **Lostock**

Proposal **Construction of six detached two bedroom bungalows and formation of access road**

Location **Land 60M West Of No. 3, Castle Walks, Croston**

Applicant **Mrs Angela Dalton**

Consultation expiry: **23rd December 2014**

Decision due by: **23rd December 2014**

Recommendation
Refuse Planning Permission

Executive Summary

The main issues to consider are whether the erection of 6 no. bungalows on the site is acceptable in principle, whether or not neighbour amenity will be harmed, if the character and appearance of the locality and Croston Conservation Area will be maintained and enhanced, if the level of parking provision and highway safety is acceptable and if there are any flooding issues. For the reasons set out below, it is not considered that the proposed development is consistent with the aims of the Framework and in accordance with the provisions of the development plan.

Representations

Croston Parish Council

The Parish Council objects to the above application on the following grounds:

- The land is currently designated as Existing Open Space (HW2) in the Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026. The Design and Access and Planning Statements do not appear to address any of the requirements under HW2
- The application fails to meet the criteria of Policy HS7: Rural Infilling, notably b) and the description of infill specifically refers to "one or possibly two houses"
- Several of the proposed plots fail to provide the requisite off road parking spaces

To date, 23 no. representations have been received:

Objection

Total No. received: 17

- Loss of views
- Impact on amenity through overlooking
- Entrance runs across a public footpath which is used by school children going to and from school
- The footpath is also part of the heritage trail
- Traffic congestion would increase
- Site is in a flood risk area
- Croston on the verge of being ruined by over development
- Noise and disturbance from construction works and traffic
- Impact on wildlife
- The view that these homes are needed by the village is rejected
- Impact on Croston Conservation Area
- There are bungalows on the market in Croston which have failed to see
- Current infrastructure cannot support extra housing
- Concerns regarding drainage
- Local schools cannot cope with additional pupils
- The development would exacerbate flooding problems
- The increase in population has resulted in a significant increase in the cases of criminal damage, robbery and general crime in the village
- Previous applications on this site have been refused

Support

Total No. received: 6

- Proposal is well designed and located
- No impact on local residents
- Will help people wishing to live in the village
- Minimal disruption to local area
- Development in keeping with local area
- The properties have been designed for accessibility and are ideal for the elderly or mobility impaired
- Land is redundant and cannot be farmed
- This should have no effect on local services such as school places or great increase in traffic
- The site is central for people to be able to walk easily to the local shop or doctor's surgery.
- Decent modern bungalows are required in the village and this has been requested in the past by members of the Parish Council
- The retention of the hedge will benefit wildlife
- Site is well screened from Yarrow Close
- The bungalows are energy saving and accessible for elderly and mobility impaired people, giving lower energy bills and practical living space

Consultees

| Consultee | Summary of Comments received |
|----------------------|--|
| LCC (Highways) | No objections to original scheme. Comments awaited on amended layout which will be reported in the addendum. |
| Conservation Officer | No objections in terms of impact on the Conservation Area from a visual perspective but advises that there is potential for harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset (Croston Castle and moat), which in the absence of information to the contrary, must be considered to be substantial. |
| Environment Agency | Initially objected to the application based on the location of the bungalows backing onto the flood bank which would have prevented emergency access and the proposed levels across the site. These objections have been withdrawn based on amended layout and levels details. |
| United Utilities | No objections subject to conditions requiring details of surface and foul water drainage. |
| LCC (Archaeology) | Initially did not suggest any conditions but following comments from the Council's Conservation Officer, updated comments still raising no objections but recommending a condition to secure a programme of archaeological work in relation to the site once being occupied by Croston Castle and its associated moat. |
| British Waterways | No comments as this application falls outside the notified area for its application scale. |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Architectural Liaison Officer | No objections but recommends development is built to Secured by Design standard. |
| LCC (Ecology) | No objections subject to conditions to secure habitat enhancement and creation measures, controlling the timing of tree felling, protection of trees and hedgerows, protection of water voles, controlling external lighting and requiring measures to protect reptiles and hedgehogs during the course of construction works. |
| Strategic Housing | The Chorley Rural Housing Needs Study suggests that there is need and demand for bungalows for older people in rural parishes, and this need is cross tenure although whether or not market bungalows actually meet local housing need depends on who they are sold to. |
| Waste and Contaminated Land Officer | Recommends a condition to require submission of a report to identify any potential sources of contamination on the site and where appropriate, necessary remediation measures. The report should include an initial desk study, site walkover and risk assessment. If the initial study identifies the potential for contamination to exist on site, the scope of a further study must then be agreed in writing with the Council and thereafter undertaken and shall include details of the necessary remediation measures. |
| LCC Public Rights of Way Officer | Comments awaited on the latest plans so these will be reported in the addendum. |

Proposed Development

1. The development proposed comprises 6 no. bungalows. Each of the properties will have 2 no. bedrooms and will be constructed using pre-fabricated SIPS (Structurally Insulated Panels). Each property will also have an open car port to the side at the rear of its driveway.
2. Access to the site will be via a continuation of Yarrow Close using a 5.5m wide access road with a footpath on one side and a turning head at its eastern end.
3. The site is located in the settlement of Croston and also in the Conservation Area. The site is bounded to the north and west by a public footpath then the back garden boundaries of the residential properties on Yarrow Close, by the applicant's property to the east and the River Yarrow to the south. The southern end of the site includes a flood bank adjacent to the River Yarrow and this is to be retained as part of this application.

Assessment

4. The main issues are as follows:-
 - Issue 1 – Principle of Development*
 - Issue 2 – Design & Scale*
 - Issue 3 - Impact on Locality*
 - Issue 4 - Impact on the Conservation Area*
 - Issue 5 – Impact on neighbours*
 - Issue 6 - Traffic & Transport*
 - Issue 7 - Ecological Impact*
 - Issue 8 - Flooding*
 - Issue 9 - S106 & CIL*

Principle of the Development

5. The National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) states that housing applications should be considered in the context of a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This means that development proposals that accord with the development plan, which comprises the Core Strategy and the adopted Chorley Local Plan Review and should be approved without delay.
6. The Inspector has issued her Partial Report on her findings into the soundness of the Chorley Local Plan, which is a material consideration in the consideration of any planning application.
7. In summary, the plan is considered to be legally compliant. In relation to soundness, the plan is considered sound, with the exception of matters relating to Gypsies & Travellers.
8. Paragraph 18 of the Partial Report states: "For the avoidance of doubt, the Plan may not be adopted until it has been changed in accordance with all of the main modifications set out in the Appendix to this partial report and any which may be specified in the Appendix of my forthcoming supplementary report. However, because of the very advanced stage in the examination process that the main modifications set out in the attached Appendix have reached, significant weight should be attached to all policies and proposals of the Plan that are amended accordingly, where necessary, except for matters relating to Gypsies and Travellers." The Council accepted the Inspectors modifications for Development Management purposes at its Executive Committee on 21st November 2013.
9. It is therefore considered that significant weight can be given to the policies and proposals of the emerging Local Plan, as amended by the main modifications. The application site is located in the settlement of Croston. The emerging Chorley Local Plan 2012 - 2026 states that within the settlement areas excluded from the Green Belt, and identified on the Policies Map, there is a presumption in favour of appropriate sustainable development.

10. The most pertinent policies which the application falls to be considered against are Policy 1 of the Core Strategy and Policy HW2 of the emerging Chorley Local Plan.
11. Policy 1 of the Core Strategy seeks to focus growth and investment on well located brownfield sites and the strategic location of central Preston, the key service centres of Chorley and Leyland and the other main urban areas in South Ribble whilst protecting the character of suburban and rural areas although it does allow some greenfield development on the fringes of the main urban areas. Under Policy 1, Croston is not specifically identified as an area identified for growth and the only development permissible is small scale and limited to appropriate infilling, conversion of buildings and proposals to meet a local need, unless there are exception reasons for larger scale development schemes. The proposed development is not considered to be infilling as defined by Policy HS7 of the emerging Chorley Local Plan so the consideration is whether or not it meets a local need.
12. The applicant has suggested that if planning permission is granted, covenants will be imposed to limit what is built on the site to that approved by this application. However, this does not mean that the proposal would meet a particular local need and there are no mechanisms in place or suggested to restrict the buyers. As such the proposed properties would create properties for sale on the open market.
13. Moreover, the applicants do not provide evidence that there is a local need for these properties and whilst there is reference to comments made previously by members of Croston Parish Council, no evidence of these comments has been provided and the formal comments made by the Parish Council on the application actually raise objections to the application. The Parish Council do not make any comments which suggest that there is a need for bungalows, or that they would support such a proposal.
14. The published Chorley Rural Housing Need study (2011) indicates a need and demand for a variety of house types in rural areas, including bungalows, but does not break this down into individual parishes, such as Croston. It shows that the majority of moving households (54.6%) would prefer detached houses, although a far lower percentage (35.5%) expect to move into such accommodation. It also suggests that 26% of moving households would prefer bungalows and that 22.3% of moving households would expect to move into such accommodation. Therefore, the study suggests a need and demand for bungalows in rural areas, but it also suggests a need and demand for detached houses and for other house types as well.
15. Whilst there may be a need and demand for properties of all types (including bungalows) in rural areas this needs to be balanced against ensuring that development takes place in locations that are suitable for growth in line with Core Strategy Policy 1. As stated, Croston is not a location where growth should be focussed and there is not sufficient evidence to demonstrate that there is a particular local need for market bungalows in Croston, to justify approval of this application, which in any case will be for properties that will be sold without restriction on the open market, rather than addressing any specific local need based on robust evidence. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would be contrary to Policy 1 of the Core Strategy and in particular criteria (f) of the policy.
16. Notwithstanding the above issue, the site is also allocated as amenity open space in the emerging Local Plan under Policy HW2: Protection of Existing Open Space, Sport and Recreational Facilities. An assessment of the proposal therefore needs to be undertaken against the criteria of this policy.
17. Policy HW2 requires alternative provision to be made under criterion a) unless the proposal meets all of criteria b) to e). The proposal is assessed against these criteria below:
 - a) *It can be demonstrated that the loss of the site would not lead to a deficit of provision in the local area in terms of quantity and accessibility.*

There is currently a significant deficit of amenity greenspace in Croston so the loss of this site would make this deficit even worse.

- b) *The site is not identified as being of high quality and/or high value in the Open Space Study.*

The site was assessed as being of high quality and high value in the Open Space Study.

- c) *It can be demonstrated that retention of the site is not required to satisfy a recreational need in the local area.*

The site is currently not accessible to the public so does not serve any recreational need at the present time.

- d) *The site does not make a significant contribution to the character of an area in terms of visual amenity.*

It is considered that the site contributes significantly to the character of the area due to its location adjacent to the River Yarrow and an area of housing.

18. The proposal fails most of the criteria therefore it is not considered to be appropriate without alternative provision to satisfy criterion a). Whilst the site is currently not accessible to the public, it is still considered that it contributes significantly to the character of the area and provides a high level of visual amenity hence the preference would be to maintain this open space rather than for it to be developed and open space to be provided elsewhere.
19. It is noted that the applicant is proposing to retain part of the site as open space which will be made accessible to the public. However the amount of open space to be retained is small relative to the size of the site and it also includes the flood bank so whilst in principle, it is considered acceptable to allow some development of the site in order to open it up to the public and provide them with recreational use of the site, based on the amount of development proposed, it is not considered that the amount of retained amenity open space is sufficient to outweigh the loss of the rest of the site to the residential development proposed.
20. In accordance with Policy HW2, any part of the open space lost to development would have to be replaced elsewhere and this could be by way of a financial contribution. However, as detailed, the amount of built development would render only a small proportion of the site available to be used as amenity open space by the community so when balancing the benefit of opening up the site against the amount which is being retained, it is not considered that the scheme is acceptable as has been submitted.

Design and Scale

21. The bungalows are of a modest scale incorporating two bedrooms with an open plan kitchen, living and dining area. Each bungalow also incorporates an open car port. The elevations are to be finished with render with feature larch boarding above the rear bi-fold doors, master bedroom window and above the roof junction to the side.
22. To the north of the site is a modern housing estate comprising a mix of detached and semi-detached two storey dwellings and bungalows. To the east of the site, the nearest property (the applicants) comprises a traditional bungalow as do the others on Castle Walks. The southern site boundary comprises the River Yarrow beyond which is a further area of open space with more traditional properties to the east and west. The site is also demarcated to the north and west by a Hawthorn hedge.

23. The boundary conditions of the site mean it is relatively self-contained and there are as stated modern two storey and bungalow properties to the north and a bungalow bounding the site to the east on Castle Walks. Therefore, in this context, it is not considered that the design and scale of the bungalows is unacceptable so they would not be contrary to the objectives of Policy BNE1 of the emerging Chorley Local Plan.

Impact on locality

24. It is considered that the existing site contributes significantly to the character of the area providing an attractive area of open green space. The sites attributes are its openness, location adjacent to the River Yarrow and its proximity to nearby residential properties to the north, east and west.
25. This being the case, it is considered that the amount of development proposed on the site, as assessed in the '*Principle of Development*' section would have a harmful impact on its character and appearance by significantly reducing its open character leaving only a small proportion of the site retained as amenity open space. It follows that the number of bungalows proposed on the site would therefore cause harm to the character and appearance of the locality so the proposed development would be contrary to Policy BNE1 of the emerging Chorley Local Plan.

Impact on the Conservation Area

26. The application site is within Croston Conservation Area, a designated heritage asset as defined by the Annex to the Framework and includes the site of Croston Castle and its associated moat. As such the site is of historic and archaeological interest.
27. Paragraphs 129, 132, 133, 134 and 136 of the Framework are pertinent as are policy 16 of the Adopted Central Lancashire Core Strategy (2012) and policy BNE8 of the emerging Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026.
28. Within the Framework paragraph 129 states that, 'Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.'
29. Paragraph 132 states, 'When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.'
30. Paragraph 133 states, 'Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:
- The nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
 - No viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
 - Conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
 - The harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.'

31. Paragraph 134 states, 'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.'
32. Paragraph 136 continues by stating that, 'Local planning authorities should not permit loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset without taking all reasonable steps to ensure the new development will proceed after the loss has occurred.'
33. The Adopted Central Lancashire Core Strategy (2012), policy 16 refers to Heritage Assets. This policy mirrors that given in the Framework and states that it seeks to, 'Protect and seek opportunities to enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting by:
Safeguarding heritage assets from inappropriate development that would cause harm to their significances.'
34. The emerging Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026, Policy BNE8 refers to the Protection and Enhancement of Heritage Assets. Essentially this policy mirrors the Framework. Paragraph b, states that, 'Applications will be granted where they sustain, conserve and, where appropriate, enhance the significance, appearance, character and setting of the heritage asset itself and the surrounding historic environment and where they show consideration for the following: iii, The Conservation and, where appropriate. The enhancement of the setting of heritage assets.'
35. The submitted Heritage Statement incorrectly states that the site is 'well away from the conservation area'. This is factually incorrect as the whole of the site is within the conservation area boundary. Furthermore it fails to recognise the potential for the site to be archaeologically sensitive, as it includes the site of Croston Castle and moat. The site could be amongst the most historically sensitive in Croston. In view of this the Council's Conservation Officer has recommended that the applicant at the very least commissions an archaeological desk-top study of the area to establish the significance of this site more fully. Depending on the outcome of that survey, it may thereafter be necessary to impose an archaeological watching brief condition to any permission that may subsequently be granted. In the absence of information concerns have been raised that the proposed development could lead to substantial harm being caused to an historically significant site within a designated heritage asset. No justification has been provided in respect of paragraph 133 of the Framework to demonstrate any public benefits for the proposed development. Nor does the application address the issues raised in the subsequent bullet points to paragraph 133. The site is designated as open space and clearly therefore has a present, viable use.
36. It is not considered properties in the immediate area of Yarrow Close are of any particular architectural interest or merit, or historic interest which is why this area was excluded from the conservation area at the time of designation, 1969, or in the subsequent review in 2001. As such, in design terms, there is no particular precedent set and the site could, subject to overcoming concerns for the loss of historic significance, provide an opportunity to enhance the quality of design in this area.
37. This notwithstanding however, the critical issue is the potential for harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, which in the absence of information to the contrary, must be considered to be substantial.
38. On the issue of Croston Castle and its associated moat, LCC (Archaeology) advise that the site is on the 1st Edition Ordnance Survey 1:10560 (Lancashire Sheet 76, surveyed 1845-46) as the site of a moat, and castle at Croston (Lancashire Historic Environment Record, PRN 949), although there are no visible remains of either on the site. The Victoria County History: A History of the County of Lancashire (Farrer & Brownhill eds., 1911) refers to the place-names Castle Place, Castle Hill & Castle Yard in Croston in the mid to late 16th century, and these may be an indication that a castle, possibly just a timber structure, did indeed exist in the medieval period.

39. An archaeological watching brief by Oxford Archaeology North in 2003 as part of flood alleviation works on the site failed to encounter any evidence for medieval occupation of the site, but this was due to the shallow nature of the topsoil stripping of the site, > 0.2m. As a result a depth of undisturbed topsoil remained and the work was not considered deep enough to reach any surviving archaeological levels that might survive on site.
40. Consequently there is a potential that the site may still contain archaeological deposits associated with a fortified medieval site which may be disturbed by the proposed development, should proposed groundworks be to a depth greater than 0.2m. Lancashire County Archaeology Service would therefore recommend that should the local planning authority be minded to grant planning permission to this, or any similar scheme, that the applicant be required to undertake a programme of archaeological work, and that such work is secured through a suitable worded condition.
41. Whilst there are some concerns regarding the potential impact of the development on the former site of Croston Castle and its moat from the Council's Conservation Officer, in light of the comments of LCC (Archaeology) recommending a condition to requiring a scheme of archaeology work, there are no objections to the application in terms of the impact of the development on the Conservation Area or the former site of Croston Castle and its moat.

Impact on neighbours

42. The floor levels of the bungalows are to be set at 7.7m AOD and the maximum difference between the existing ground levels and floor levels is approximately 0.7m at the eastern end of the site. However, the properties are bungalows and the Hawthorn hedge is to be retained along the northern boundary after which there is a public footpath and then the garden boundaries of the properties on Yarrow Close so this set of circumstances means that the occupiers of the properties on Yarrow Close will not be overlooked from the properties nor will their outlook be affected nor will the bungalows lead to a detrimental loss of light or outlook. Also, the bungalows will not cause detrimental overshadowing due to their single storey scale
43. Amendments to the site layout has also addressed a previous concern about the sizes of the gardens associated with the bungalows and the fact that the rear gardens would have backed onto the flood bank thus preventing access in an emergency.

Traffic & Transport

44. Access to the site would be via a continuation of Yarrow Close which at the present time terminates at the north western corner of the site. The access road incorporates a footpath on its northern site and is proposed to be 5.5m wide. A turning head is provided at the end of the access road which also provides access to plot 5 and plot 6. Access to the river is shown retained on the plans. Each property will have adequate off road parking and the turning head will enable refuse vehicles to turn around on collection days.
45. LCC (Highways) did not raise any objections to the original scheme and their comments are awaited on the latest layout. These will be reported in the addendum.

Ecological Impacts

46. The applicant has submitted an Ecological Survey and Assessment. LCC (Ecology) have considered the content and conclusions of this report and do not raise any objections to the application on this basis subject to conditions to secure habitat enhancement and creation measures, controlling the timing of tree felling, protection of trees and hedgerows, protection of water voles, controlling external lighting and requiring measures to protect reptiles and hedgehogs during the course of construction works. Accordingly, if the application was the subject of a favourable recommendation, these would be secured through conditions. The proposed development therefore complies with the objectives of Policy BNE10 of the emerging Chorley Local Plan.

Flood Risk

47. The application site is within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and the Environment Agency initially objected to the application based on the location of the bungalows backing onto the flood bank which would have prevented emergency access and the proposed levels across the site.
48. These objections have now been addressed through amendments to the layout of the development in that the road has been moved next to the flood bank whilst the floor levels of the bungalows are to be set at 7.7m AOD (Above Ordnance Datum) with finished ground levels set no higher than 7.4m AOD. The Environment Agency advises that these levels should be the subject of a condition.

S106 and CIL

49. The National Planning Practice Guidance was updated by Government on 28 November 2014 in respect of contributions for affordable housing and tariff style planning obligations. These measures were introduced to support small scale developers by reducing disproportionate burdens on developer contributions. The updated guidance confirms that such contributions should not be sought from small scale and self-build development. In particular, the guidance states that contributions should not be sought from developments of 10 units or less, and which have a maximum combined gross floorspace of no more than 1000m².
50. This development results in the creation of 6 no. units, which is below the 10 unit threshold and also has a combined gross floorspace of less than 1000m².
51. In the case of this development there is no evidence at this time, which is directly related to the development, to justify seeking a contribution towards public open space contrary to the national guidance.
52. The proposed bungalows attract a charge under the Council's CIL charging schedule which totals £43680.

Other Matters

Sustainability

53. In line with Policy 27 of the Core Strategy, the bungalows will be required to be constructed to meet the relevant level of the Code for Sustainable Homes which is Level 4 until 2016 and level 6 thereafter and the applicant has indicated that the bungalows would meet level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes. The standard conditions would therefore be imposed to secure this if the application was being recommended for approval.

Waste Collection and Storage

54. There is sufficient space within the curtilage of each bungalow for waste bins to be stored and on collection days, bins can be placed kerbside collection.

Public Footpath

55. Footpath no. 5 crosses the proposed entrance point into the site and this has been the subject of numerous objections from local residents. The views of LCC's Public Rights of Way Officer have been sought and will be reported in the addendum.

Overall Conclusion

56. It is considered that the design and scale, access, parking provision and impact on neighbours is acceptable. Likewise, the initial objection from the Environment Agency has been addressed and it is not considered that the development will harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
57. However, the 'principle' of the proposed development is not considered to be acceptable as it would be contrary to criteria (f) of Policy 1 of the Core Strategy in that the development is not a proposal to meet local need (i.e. affordable housing).

58. In terms of the designation of the site as amenity open space in the emerging Chorley Local Plan, whilst the layout proposes the retention of some of the site and its opening up to the public, the proportion of the site retained is not considered sufficient to justify the loss of the rest of the site to residential development. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policy HW2 of the emerging Chorley Local Plan. The amount of development proposed on the site would also have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the locality contrary to Policy BNE1 of the emerging Chorley Local Plan.

Planning Policies

59. 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 Borough Local Plan Review 2003 and adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance), unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Consideration of the proposals has had regard to guidance contained with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), the development plan and the emerging Local Plan 2012-2026. The specific policies/ guidance considerations are contained within the body of the report.

Planning History

| Reference | Description | Decision | Date |
|------------------|---|-----------------|-------------|
| 81/01031/OUT | Outline application for 7 houses and 1 bungalow | Refused | 28.09.1982 |
| 84/00046/FUL | Erection of one detached bungalow | Refused | 17.04.1984 |
| 89/00221/OUT | Outline application for residential development on 0.8 hectares of land | Refused | 22.08.1989 |
| 92/00074/OUT | Outline application for residential development | Withdrawn | 09.05.1992 |

Suggested Reasons for Refusal

| No. | Reason |
|------------|---|
| 1. | Criteria (f) of Policy 1 of the Central Lancashire Core Strategy states that in smaller villages, development will typically be small scale and limited to appropriate infilling, conversion of buildings and proposals to meet local need, unless there are exceptional reasons for larger scale development schemes. The development does not meet a specific local need and there are no exceptional reasons overriding these matters which justify granting it planning permission. The proposed development is therefore contrary to criteria (f) of Policy 1 of the Central Lancashire Core Strategy. |
| 2. | There is a deficit of amenity open space in Croston and the site is identified as open space under Policy HW2 of the emerging Chorley Local Plan. Development resulting in the loss of such sites is only acceptable when alternative provision is provided. Whilst the development incorporates the retention of some of the site as open space and will open it up to the public, the amount of retained open space constitutes only a small proportion of the site so opening up this land to the public is not sufficient to outweigh the harm caused by the loss of the majority of the site. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policy HW2 of the emerging Chorley Local Plan. |
| 3. | The proposed development would lead to the loss of a large proportion of open space which makes a significant contribution to the character of the area. The reduction in the open character of the site would be contrary to criteria a) of Policy BNE1 of the emerging Chorley Local Plan which seeks to ensure development does not have a significantly detrimental impact on the local area. |