

Agenda Item 3I

APPLICATION REPORT – 16/00633/OUTMAJ

Validation Date: 4 August 2016

Ward: Euxton South

Type of Application: Major Outline Planning

Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 13no detached houses with double garages and associated infrastructure

Location: Gleadhill House Stud Gleadhill House Dawbers Lane Euxton Chorley PR7 6EA

Case Officer: Mr Paul Whittingham

Applicant: Mr David Forshaw

Agent: Mr Bob Margerison

RECOMMENDATION

Approve subject to Conditions and S106 agreement

SITE DESCRIPTION

1. The site of Gledhill Stud is located to the south of Euxton with existing access to Dawbers Lane. The site is bounded by a stone wall in excess of 2metres fronting Dawbers Lane and separating the site from Euxton Park open space area. To the north is Euxton Park Care Home and Euxton Park Hospital, to the east is Euxton Park or the Millenium Green whilst to the south west is Fieldside Avenue. To the west of the existing complex of buildings are open fields used by the stud for grazing.
2. There is access through this site to existing buildings to the north west and a training track or gallops that is sited beyond an existing woodland within which there is a public footpath that extends from the A49 westwards past this site to meet up with Dawbers Lane.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

3. The proposal is an outline application with all matters except access being reserved, to redevelop the site of the Gleadhill Stud that consists of Gledhill House, 3 residential buildings used for jockey accommodation in addition to the large stable complex and associated infrastructure for up to 13 self-build dwellings.
4. The site is located in the Green Belt as defined by the Chorley Local Plan and is on the north of Dawbers Lane, with direct vehicular access off Dawbers Lane using the existing gated access to the original large house. There would be a requirement from LCC highways to improve the junction with Dawbers Lane and widen the footpath towards

the A49. It is also proposed to extend the current high stone wall fronting Dawbers Lane northwards into the site at the western edge of the application site and also a proposed advance planting tree belt to the west of the site with woodland understorey planting to the north.

REPRESENTATIONS

Six letters of objection have been received that raise the following comments:-

- Able to see the new buildings from my kitchen window (blight)? When will this stop. It will only increase traffic now and if and when the sand quarry starts to produce, the traffic along Dawbers Lane will be horrific. It could possibly spoil the outlook from my House.
- The proposals are contrary to the guidance given in the National Planning Policy Framework and the councils own guidance for development within greenbelt areas, despite the claims made by the applicant in their statements to the contrary. The former Pincock Mill is an eyesore and should be developed before any fields are built on. I would have thought that the former Camelot site should also be developed before building on green belt.
- The development proposed isn't contained within the confines of the original farm / outbuildings and sprawls out onto undeveloped land which in my opinion has a direct impact on the openness of the greenbelt, whether it is visible from the road or not.
- The other concern this proposal raises is what will happen to the land around the current site if the existing stud farm / buildings were demolished to make way for housing.
- Euxton is already overdeveloped and the proposed dwellings can hardly be classified as 'much needed'. There are already many developments and additional housing projects in and around Euxton, Astley Village and Buckshaw. Surely this is adequate enough for a small village, considering the lack of infrastructure to support a growing population.
- Nothing in it benefits the local community, the developer does not provide any suggestion of appropriate development in any of the exceptions listed in the National Planning Policy, Chorley Local Plan or Rural Development SPD. In fact, this development is everything the Local Plan and National Planning Policy attempt to stop.

Euxton Parish Council comments are as follows:-

1. Euxton Parish Council (EPC) has a long history of opposing development in the green fields and especially in the Green Belt that surrounds the village. There are many examples that could be given in support of this statement. Amongst these were EPC's opposition to some of the extensive new green field housing developments that were proposed under the now confirmed Chorley Local Plan (CLP) as it passed through its various stages.
2. Once it was approved, however, EPC accepted CLP as the basis for its responses to new development applications and has not sought to oppose in principle developments that were submitted in accordance with it, although it may have made comment or objection on matters of detail. Also, EPC has supported CLP in its response to development proposals that were not in accordance with it. Examples are the recently proposed development at land off Pear Tree Lane and the consultation proposal by Chorley Borough Council (CBC) to replace sports and recreation facilities, in Euxton, at Chorley Rugby Club with a care home and associated housing. EPC has relied upon CLP as the basis for its response to development applications - it had a long and thorough preparation and examination period and EPC hopes that this was not simply a waste of time – for members of the public, for parish councils and local pressure groups, for the professionals that prepared, presented and defended the Plan, and for the Inspector who prepared a long and detailed report of the proceedings and of her conclusions.
3. It is worthy of note, because it concerns a site close to the application site, that on only one occasion in recent years has EPC actively supported housing development in the Green Belt. This is at the former Euxton Mill (Xelflex) site where the EPC took the view that proposed developments for a retirement living community and later for self-build housing were in

accordance with Policy BNE5 of CLP and also for the more pragmatic reason that something needs to be done with this eyesore of a site in a potentially most attractive location.

4. So, CLP is the basis of EPC's objection to the proposals at Gleadhill House. The entire site subject of the application is within the Green Belt. The main house and its satellite residential properties, including gardens, occupy only a small proportion (roughly one fifth) of the application site and EPC would have no objection to the redevelopment of this part of the site provided that it met the requirements of Policy BNE5.
5. Another part of the site, of slightly less area than the house etc, is used for stabling and equestrian training facilities. It is not used for residential purposes. EPC can see no reason why this land, used in connection with a rural industry, should be converted to housing, but would accept that, if it is no longer viable in its current use, a new use will be required. EPC does not know if the applicant has sought to dispose of the site in its current use. It is also noted that for this part of the site and for the adjacent field (see next paragraph) no planning application has been submitted for a change of use to residential.
6. The remainder of the application site, approximately two thirds of the total, is open field pasture. EPC does not consider this an acceptable opportunity for residential development any more than any other currently undeveloped site in the Green Belt. If development, residential or otherwise, is acceptable here it must be equally acceptable at any other undeveloped location within the Green Belt, in Euxton or beyond, and many landowners would be tempted to increase the value of their holding by a large multiplier, referring to the Gleadhill site as their example to follow.
7. EPC is therefore strongly opposed to this proposed development.
8. There are other aspects of this proposed development that concern EPC. The first is the encouragement that it appears to have received from the CBC Planning Section. The consultations with the Planning Officer are reported in the Design and Access Statement that is included with the application. The consultations may have been selectively reported but at no point does the Planning Officer appear to have expressed any concerns about a proposal for development in the Green Belt and in conflict with the CLP, but only suggests how the proposal might be improved. EPC would be most concerned if this view of CLP and the Green Belt is generally taken by the CBC Planning Department and wonders if it reflects the view of the Borough Council.
9. The nearby Euxton Mill site (see para 3) is clearly in some difficulties and the developer has already had two attempts at finding a viable proposal and has made a false start on implementation. This is a potentially very attractive site with the rare opportunity of a river frontage. It may have been an opportunity for high-end housing, such as is now proposed at Gleadhill House. Surely, efforts by the Planning Department to assist a developer to find the best option would be better applied here, where a solution is clearly required for the benefit of the developer and the local and wider community, than they are to a site where housing is not wanted by the local community because it is in conflict with CLP and is in the Green Belt.
10. EPC is reluctant to discuss the consequences of accepting this development, which it is sure should be rejected as a matter of principle. However, in the most unlikely event of it being considered acceptable, EPC is concerned about those consequences for the large area of agricultural land to the north. The buildings and facilities that service this land are situated to the north of Gleadhill House, just outside the application site. Although there are alternative, very indirect, routes to these buildings from outside the area, the only direct one is to and from Dawbers Lane past Gleadhill House. The application makes provision for this to be retained, but passing through the new housing estate. This would not be a satisfactory means of serving a large area of farmland, especially for the residents of the estate.
11. This leads EPC to ask how the developer and CBC see the future of this farmland, if the buildings that serve it are effectively cut off from access? It is at present used for equestrian purposes, but it must be assumed that the loss of the stabling etc would make it no longer fit for this purpose. How is it to be used? Is CBC content that not only would approval of this

application conflict with Green Belt and CLP, but would also effectively render the large area of land to the north with a very uncertain future - perhaps lining up future residential development proposals?

12. In conclusion EPC considers that this development, in conflict with the recently approved CLP and the Green Belt and raising issues about the future of a much larger area of land, should be rejected out of hand. A new application which sought to redevelop only the existing residential parts of the site would be acceptable provided it met the requirements of CLP Policy BNE5.

CONSULTATIONS

Lancashire Highway Services – No objection subject to conditions see the body of the report
Lancashire Constabulary Architectural Liaison – No objection subject to conditions

Trees – No objection subject to the retention of the significant specimen trees

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit – No objections subject to conditions

Planning Policy – comments included within the report

Planning Policy (Open Space) – Requirement for Playing Pitch and allotments totalling £20,997

United Utilities – No objection subject to Conditions

Lancashire County Council Archaeology Service - No objection

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Principle of the Development

5. The application site is within the Green Belt with a proportion of the site being occupied by existing buildings and the stud whilst the remainder of the application site is used in association with the stud but is greenfield land.

6. National guidance on Green Belt is contained in Chapter 9 of the Framework which states:

79. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.

80. Green Belt serves five purposes:

- to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

89. A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:

limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.

7. The application site constitutes partial previously developed land within the Green Belt which would engage within the exception contained within paragraph 89 of The Framework involving the complete redevelopment of a previously developed site on the proviso that the development does not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it.

8. Policy BNE5 of the Adopted Local Plan relates to previously developed land within the Green Belt and reflects guidance contained within the Framework as follows:
The reuse, infilling or redevelopment of previously developed sites in the Green Belt, will be permitted providing the following criteria are met:
In the case of re-use
a) The proposal does not have a materially greater impact than the existing use on the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land in it;
b) The development respects the character of the landscape and has regard to the need to integrate the development with its surroundings, and will not be of significant detriment to features of historical or ecological importance.
- In the case of redevelopment:
d) The appearance of the site as a whole is maintained or enhanced and that all proposals, including those for partial redevelopment, are put forward in the context of a comprehensive plan for the site as a whole.
9. The construction of the new buildings will constitute inappropriate development unless one of the exceptions in the Framework is engaged. To benefit from the relevant exception in the case of this site, the applicant must demonstrate that the construction of the new buildings constitutes:
- The partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land;
 - Which would not have a greater impact on the “openness” of the Green Belt; and
 - Which would not have a greater impact on the purposes of including land in the Green Belt.
10. Whilst the test for sites such as this relates to the impact on openness it is important to note that the Framework contains no specific definition of ‘openness’.
11. It is considered that in respect of the Framework that the buildings on site have an impact on the openness of the Green Belt when viewed from public vantage points, including to the north from the public footpath network and there is an impact to openness simply because the buildings/structures exist. The remainder of the application site would be considered as greenfield development and so does not meet the exceptions within the Framework or Development Plan policy.
12. The proposed development as a whole does constitute inappropriate development and as such the tests of paragraph 88 of the Framework are engaged. In this case very special circumstances need to be demonstrated which outweigh the harm the development will have to the Green Belt.
13. The scale of the existing built form is split between the residential elements on the site that in accordance with the development plan can be replaced 30% larger and the stables buildings that can be replaced with a like for like volume within Policy. The volume of the existing residential units with an increase of 30% is 6569.08m³ with the addition of the volume of the stables buildings (4453.8m³) equates to 11,022.88m³. The applicant is seeking a volume of 12,100m³ which is a greater volume than that which would be considered acceptable in policy. Very special circumstances would need to be demonstrated for this increase in volume to deliver this self-build scheme.
14. The application is for upto 13 residential units based on a self-build programme with the reserved matters applications being constrained by the upper volume limit of 12,100m³ for the whole site. In theory therefore the site may not be fully developed out for 13 houses as this will depend on which self-build purchasers come forward. The limit on the volume would be controlled through the legal agreement and the phasing of the site, covered by condition the applicant has also agreed that the self-build properties would be controlled through the legal agreement to the effect that they would not be extended in the future and so what is built as a self-build property would be the limit of the scale of the development within the application site. The additional volume proposed to be built

is considered acceptable in principal having regard to the very special circumstances considered below and the constraints on future development that would be imposed. I have also taken into account that existing residential units could be extended or the proposed houses could be extended in future and this could potentially result in greater volumes of building on site.

Very Special Circumstances

15. Very Special Circumstances are required to be demonstrated to support the development as a whole despite part of the site being the redevelopment of a previously developed site.
16. The site is proposed to be completed as a self-build scheme and under the Housing and Planning Act 2016 and the Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 places a duty on Local Planning Authorities to identify sites, maintain a register and deliver suitable sites to meet demand. The applicant has identified interest from 4 people and the Council register has two registered people. The applicant also has evidence of the delivery of a self-build site at Farington Lodge in Leyland which was an 11 dwelling scheme built under a design code with the whole site now complete from the granting of consent in 2011.
17. The scheme at Leyland – Farington Lodge secured self-build customers that were seeking to invest in an individual property but also take forward business opportunities in the local area and a number of the individuals who have purchased these self-build properties are business leaders within the local area. There is no guarantee that these self-build properties will deliver jobs and investment within Chorley however there is evidence that would support the potential.
18. The footpath connections from the site entrance towards the A49 are not in accordance with modern standards with narrow footpaths and limited widths on both sides of Dawbers Lane. As part of the development the layby style space at the site entrance will be modified to improve the footpath and ensure that vehicles entering and exiting the application site approach Dawbers Lane at right angles to ensure that the visibility of vehicles exiting is improved.
19. There are a number of improvements and landscaping proposals that provide mitigation to visual impact but also will benefit the wider development site and surroundings. The shelter belt to the west of the site and extending the stone wall at the western boundary into the site all provide improvements and benefits to the scheme as a whole. Understorey planting in the woodlands to the north and improvements to the footpath within this woodland that is regularly used by local people and dog walkers is considered as a whole to be a significant benefit to the scheme.
20. The benefits of the redevelopment of the site consist of the removal of the built form from the eastern boundary that is visible from the woodland footpaths frequently used and the redevelopment would also remove the significant built form from the road access from the site to the land beyond but where the footpath crosses this access. This change is significant and beneficial as the development is imposing upon this public vantage point.
21. As detailed further within this report the public open space requirement would be £20,997 as a contribution to borough wide provision of playing pitches, the applicant is aware of the concerns of Euxton Parish Council and other objections that this development is not contributing to local needs and wishes to put forward a contribution of £50k to local provision of public open space and tied to this in the legal agreement. There are schemes locally that need funding to be delivered and are important to local provision and therefore such a sum can deliver local benefit and significant weight is attached to this provision that would not necessarily be secured by the standard S106 agreement.

- 22. There is concern locally about provision of school places and as this site is not an allocated site and would be considered to be a windfall site then it is appropriate for the consideration of the provision of school places. The assessment, that has been updated to reflect the current proposal for upto 13 dwellings would require £67,372.65 and this contribution to primary education is a material consideration that would carry significant weight.
- 23. The site will deliver self-build properties that will seek to attract investors and support the Councils register of self-build sites however the site in accordance with Core Strategy Policy 7 requires developments of 5 or more dwellings in rural areas to provide 35% affordable housing. Recent changes to the NPPG set a threshold of 11 or more dwellings for tariff style contributions. This development would therefore be required to provide contributions in accordance with the Councils SPD which would be set out within the legal agreement if the development is approved. The provision of an off-site affordable housing contribution is a material consideration that would carry significant weight.

Visual Impact

- 19. It has been established in case law that openness and visual impact are different concepts in terms of Green Belt Policy. However they can relate to each other and as such the visual impact is a material consideration. In *Heath & Hampsted Society v LB of Camden [2007] EWHC 977*, the difference between openness and visual impact was explained as follows:
- 21. The discussion above is concerned with the size of the replacement dwellings, not with its visual impact. There are good reasons why the relevant test for replacement dwellings in the Green Belt and replacement of stables with dwellings is one of size rather than visual impact. The essential characteristic of Green Belts is their openness. The extent to which that openness is, or is not, visible from public vantage points and the extent to which a new building in the Green Belt would be visually intrusive are a separate issue...

The fact that a materially larger (in terms in footprint, floor space or building volume) replacement dwelling is more concealed from public view than a smaller but more prominent existing dwelling does not mean that the replacement dwelling is appropriate development in the Green Belt.

- 20. When interpreting paragraph 89 of the Framework the Judge in *Timmins v Gedling BC and Westerleigh Group Limited [2014]* analysed the relationship between openness and visual impact. He held inter alia:

74. Any construction harms openness quite irrespective of its impact in terms of its obtrusiveness or its aesthetic attractions or qualities. A beautiful building is still an affront to openness, simply because it exists. The same applies to a building this is camouflaged or rendered unobtrusive by felicitous landscaping.

- 21. In this case the Judge concluded that:

78. In short it seems to me that there are three points which arise from the above analysis. First, there is a clear conceptual distinction between openness and visual impact. Secondly, it is wrong in principle to arrive at a specific conclusion as to openness by reference to visual impact. Thirdly, when considering however whether a development in the Green Belt which adversely impacts upon openness can be justified by very special circumstances it is not wrong to take account of the visual impact of a development as one, inter alia, of the considerations that form part of the overall weighing exercise.

22. As the development falls to be considered inappropriate development the landscape/visual impact of the proposed development is a key material consideration in terms of the overall balance as to whether there is harm.
23. The development site generally benefits from a level of containment created by the local topography, surrounding walls and existing trees and woodland areas around the boundaries of the site. A large part of the site is effectively 'screened' when viewed externally from Dawbers Lane with the main views of the site from the footpath which runs within the woodland to the north.
24. Longer distant views have been assessed and there is little impact from the changes resulting from the development proposed. In terms of the views from the footpath to the north, the proposed properties are being moved away from the walled boundary to the east, reducing the visual impact compared to the current position, the other more significant improvement is the point where the footpath crosses the track running north, where views of a very dense cluster of permanent buildings has a current significant impact. The view from this point would be significantly improved with properties being spread out within the site and landscaping around this access road that will be maintained for access to the stables buildings and exercise track beyond that will mitigate the development in the future.
25. In terms of views from Dawbers Lane and from the west, the maintenance of the tree belt running along the Dawbers Lane frontage within the site and the separation of garden curtilages from this boundary together with the extension of the wall into the site at the western end will support the sites integration into the contained landscape and limits visual impact. To the west there is proposed to be a landscaping shelter belt and it is proposed that this would be delivered in advance or at an early stage of the development to allow for this to mature as the site is delivered, this would be controlled by condition. It is considered that the proposed additional landscaping and design and layout of the site all contribute to the visual impact of the proposed development being limited.
26. In conclusion the site is a contained site and due to the package of mitigation measures then the visual impact is considered to be limited.

Ecology

27. The bat survey information found no signs of bats or bat usage. However given that the site is located adjacent to excellent foraging habitat and bats are highly mobile creatures, I would advise that an informative be placed on any permission that if bats or signs of bats are found at any time during works, then work should cease immediately and advice be sought from Natural England or a suitably qualified bat worker. The final two bullet points in the recommendations section of the phase 1 survey report should also be required by condition.
28. With regard to other ecological issues, based on the recommendations in the Extended Phase 1 Survey of the site I would advise that the following conditions (BS 42020:2013) be attached to any permission:
 29. Following the Supreme Court ruling (Morge vs Hampshire County Council – Supreme Court ruling Jan 2011) the Local Authority now have a responsibility to consult Natural England on proposals which may affect protected species and ask the following questions:
 - Is the proposal likely to result in a breach of the Habitats Regulations?
 - If so, is Natural England likely to grant a licence?
 30. Natural England has not been consulted on the proposals as it is not considered that the proposals will result in a breach of the Habitats Regulations.

31. Following the high court decision (R (on the application of Simon Woolley) v Cheshire East Borough Council, June 2009) the Local Planning Authority have a legal duty to determine whether the three 'derogation tests' of the Habitats Directive implemented by the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) Regulations 1994 have been met when determining whether to grant planning permission for a development which could harm a European Protected Species. The three tests include:
 - (a) the activity must be for imperative reasons of overriding public interest of for public health and safety;
 - (b) there must be no satisfactory alternative and
 - (c) favourable conservation status of the species must be maintained.
32. This requirement does not negate the need for a Licence from Natural England in respect of Protected Species and the Local Planning Authority are required to engage with the Directive.
33. The Framework (para 118) confirms that when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity by applying the following principles: if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused.
34. As such the Framework adopts a tiered/ cascade approach in that the first test is whether there is an alternative to developing the site. The development has possible beneficial consequences to the environment with the potential to deliver ecological improvements directly related to the erection of housing on this site. As such it is considered that the first two derogation tests and the alternative site test within the Framework are met in that there is no satisfactory alternative.
35. The next test is whether a favourable conservation status of protected species will be maintained and whether the biodiversity impacts are adequately mitigated. As set out above it is considered that a favourable status of protected species will be maintained. To compensate for the limited habitat losses and to ensure that the proposed scheme does not adversely impact on protected species suitable conditions are proposed. As such it is considered that the Local Authority has engaged with the three tests of the Habitats Directive and the guidance contained with the Framework and from an ecological perspective the proposals are acceptable.

Highways

36. The proposed layout is acceptable in principle, however, it should be provided and constructed to the Lancashire County Council Specification for Construction of Estate Roads to be accepted for adoption under the Section 38 agreement of the Highways Act 1980. In this regard, while the proposed 5.5m width of the site access is acceptable, the footways proposed along the access should be 2.0m wide. Improvements are also required at the site access for the development to meet acceptable highway adoption standard. The proposed footways on both sides of the access should be extended from the development to connect the existing footway along Dawbers Lane, so that pedestrians going in and out of the site would not have to use the live carriageway in doing so. Similarly, the rear vehicular access should be provided, such that it can allow future extension to the land beyond the application site, in which case the 5.5m access width should be maintained up to the application site boundary with 2.0m footways on both sides. Parking should be provided to the current Chorley Council Parking Standard with the proposed garages provided to sizes of 6.0m x 3.0m for a single garage and 6.0m x 6.0m for double.
37. As the proposed development would result in more vehicles using the access than at present, the presence of the existing layby across the access is not considered to be in the best interest of highway safety, as due to its available width, motorists may inappropriately use any section of the layby to access and egress the site. An improvement would therefore be required to ensure that the site can be accessed and

egressed using a clearly defined access. This would require the provision of some form of a build-out to delineate the site access from the layby and ensure that the access is brought forward to the edge of the carriageway for improved visibility. As part of the highway improvements, the section of footway to the back of the layby should be widened such that at its narrowest the width of the footway would not be less than 2.0m. I have attached a rough sketch suggesting the required build-out, the size of which would be agreed on site. the applicant may however, provide their own design for the approval of the highway authority. The off-site highway works would be undertaken through the Section 278 agreement of the Highways Act 1980 with the full cost of the works borne by the applicant.

Public Open Space Contributions

38. THE TOTAL FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTION REQUIRED FROM THIS DEVELOPMENT IS AS FOLLOWS:

Amenity greenspace	= £0
Equipped play area	= £0
Parks/Gardens	= £0
Natural/semi-natural	= £0
Allotments	= £210
Playing Pitches	= £20,787
Total	= £20,997

39. The applicant has stated that they wish to support the provision of local services and public open space provision and have increased the above figure to £50k to support specific schemes in the local area that are supported by the Parish Council and where funding has yet to be secured.

School Places

40. There is a request from Lancashire County Council for funding towards primary school places that amounts to £67,372.65 and as this is not an allocated site then the applicant would support the provision of this payment and it would be secured through the legal agreement.

Affordable Housing

41. Core Strategy Policy 7 requires developments of 5 or more dwellings in rural areas to provide 35% affordable housing. Recent changes to the NPPG set a threshold of 11 or more dwellings for tariff style contributions. Affordable housing would be required from a development such as this however this development is a self-build scheme that aims to attract investors and employers and it is therefore appropriate for an off-site affordable housing contribution that would be calculated in accordance with the Councils SPD and incorporated within the S106 document.

CIL

42. The development would be CIL liable however as the intention would be to deliver a self-build scheme then the individual owners and occupiers of the plots would have to claim the self-build exemption in accordance with the regulations. It is therefore likely that there would be no CIL contribution from this development if all of the self-build exemptions are complied with.

CONCLUSION

43. Balancing the size and scale of the existing buildings, together with the character of the site and existing and potential level of activity on the site together with the mitigation proposals put forward and the community benefits put forward, it is considered that the proposed dwellings (together with associated gardens, driveways and planting) would

not have any significantly greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt that would warrant a reason for refusal. The proposal is therefore considered to be an appropriate form of development within the Green Belt having regard to the specific very special circumstances put forward and in accordance with the Framework and the development plan as a whole.

RELEVANT POLICIES: 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 Local Plan 2012-2026 and adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance), unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Consideration of the proposal has had regard to guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the development plan. The specific policies/ guidance considerations are contained within the body of the report.

RELEVANT HISTORY OF THE SITE

Ref: 03/00490/TPO Decision: PERTRE Decision Date: 31 July 2003
Description: Felling of four Mature Beech Trees under TPO (Euxton) 1982 ref A1

Ref: 08/00001/TPO Decision: PERTRE Decision Date: 8 February 2008
Description: Works to trees covered by TPO 1 (Euxton) 1971, TPO 4 (Euxton Hall) 1982, and TPO 5 (Euxton) 1993, including felling of 18 trees,

Ref: 16/00633/OUTMAJ Decision: PCO Decision Date:
Description: Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 14no detached houses with double garages and associated infrastructure

Ref: 90/00016/FUL Decision: PERFPP Decision Date: 22 May 1990
Description: Change of use of first floor to saddlery and first floor of garage to residential

Ref: 86/00701/FUL Decision: PERFPP Decision Date: 13 January 1987
Description: Erection of stables and staff accommodation

Ref: 85/00202/FUL Decision: PERFPP Decision Date: 29 March 1985
Description: Erection of car port with hay loft over

Suggested Conditions

To Follow