

## REPORT OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

### GENERAL REPORT

1. Since the last Council the Development Control Committee met on 17 July 2007 and 14 August 2007. This report refers briefly to the more significant planning proposals that were considered at these meetings.

#### 17 July 2007

#### Planning Application 07/00453/COU

2. We considered the above retrospective planning application for the change of use of residential curtilage and a further parcel of land to enable the storage of 35 additional caravans at Park View, Runshaw Lane, Euxton, Chorley
3. The application increased the number of caravans from the presently lawful 10 that could be stored within the residential curtilage to 35 caravans comprising of an additional 20 within the residential curtilage and a further 5 on adjoining land.
4. The Committee received representations from the applicant, an objector and a supporter of the application.
5. The storage of caravans is not expressly in any of the categories of appropriate development in the Green Belt given in Policy DC1 or in PPG2
7. The storage of the caravans on the land would be a prominent feature in this rural area, even more so than the concentration of an additional 30 caravans within the applicant's residential curtilage proposed by the 2005 application, as the caravans would be spread over a larger area of the site.
8. The volume of representations that had been made in support of the application expressed concerns at the loss of the site. It was not disputed that there was limited facilities for caravan storage but it was considered that this not carry sufficient weight to override the presumption against caravan storage in the Green Belt.
8. It was considered that the caravan storage was inappropriate development in the Green Belt and that there were no "very special circumstances" to justify granting planning permission, whilst the use also resulted in detrimental harm to highway safety.
9. After listening to the representations and considering the information in the officer's report we refused planning permission for the reasons set out in the officers report.

#### Planning Application 07/00469/FULMAJ

10. We considered the above planning application that proposed the erection of a two-storey office building, which represented Phase 3 of the Clayton Park Business Park. The scheme consisted of 151sq m of office space with 36 car parking spaces on a 0.28 ha site.
11. The building had been designed as a two-storey office with 1m wide by 300mm deep terracotta panels and extensive use of glazing and a flat roof. The site had an open aspect to Preston Road as the building had been positioned with the car parking and landscape orientated towards it. The design was a significant modern addition to the Business Park, which it was considered, would make a positive contribution to the local area.
12. The site would be accessed through the existing states by vehicles, however pedestrians could access the building from the bus stop on Preston Road. The site was within a few hundred metres of the facilities at Clayton Green with a leisure complex and Library and beyond that is a large supermarket and pub/diner.
13. There were two residential properties to the north and south of the development but it was not considered that the office would affect the amenity of the houses.
14. After considering all the information in the officer's report we decide to grant full planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the report.

14 August 2007

#### Planning Application 07/00346/OUT

15. We considered the above planning application for the erection of 5 detached dormer bungalows on land 40m South of 48 Lancaster Lane, Clayton-Le-Woods, to include an amended access of the highway between no's 46 and 48 Lancaster Lane, Clayton-Le-Woods.
16. During the application process the scheme had been amended to alleviate concerns raised in respect of the originally submitted proposal, mainly the impact on the amenities of the neighbouring residents, the impact on the amenities of future residents and Members felt the proposal would constitute over development of the site and that there would be a loss of private amenity space.
17. Concerns had also been raised in respect to highway safety and the increase in traffic to the site. The maximum number of dwellings usually permitted on a private access road is three and this development clearly exceeded this number.

18. It was also noted that a previous application was recently refused at 54 Lancaster Lane for residential development. One of the reasons for refusal had been the potential to an influx of sporadic similar developments within the area that had the potential to impact on highway safety and the character of the area.
19. The Committee received representations from an objector and the ward representative and after considering all the information we refused to grant planning permission.

#### Planning Application 07/00489/FULMAJ

20. We considered the above planning application for the proposed livestock building and associated access track at Bradley Hall, Parr Lane, Ecclestone.
21. The proposed building would be a portal framed structure with the gable walls and the roof clad in grey profile metal sheeting with the side elevations comprising of Yorkshire boardings. All the walls would be set on 1.2m high concrete blockwork walls. The building would be sited in separate field, 120m to the north east of the main farm with access available via an existing track.
22. Bradley Hall Farmhouse is a Grade II Listed Building that also includes a moat that is a Scheduled Ancient Monument hence the applicants reasoning behind proposing the building in the separate field.
23. Whilst it was considered that the building was of a substantial size, the proposed location would benefit from existing screening and additional planting could be secured through a condition.
24. The building itself was of a typical design commonly found in rural areas so it was considered that the building would not have a detrimental impact on the character and openness of the Green Belt.
25. After considering the information in the officer's report we decided to grant full planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the report.

#### Recommendation

26. That the report be noted.

COUNCILLOR HAROLD HEATON  
Chair of the Development Control Committee

DS

There are no background papers to this report.