

APPLICATION REPORT – 17/00792/OUTMAJ

Validation Date: 7 August 2017

Ward: Eccleston And Mawdesley

Type of Application: Major Outline Planning

Proposal: Outline application (with all matters reserved) for the erection of up to 33 dwellinghouses and the provision of community allotments.

Location: Land South Of Parr Lane Eccleston

Case Officer: Caron Taylor

Authorising Officer:

Applicant: Metacre Ltd

Agent: Mr Alexis De Pol

Consultation expiry: 7 September 2017

Decision due by: 6 November 2017

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the application is refused.

SITE DESCRIPTION

2. The application site comprises approximately 1.5 ha of grassland adjoining the village inset of Eccleston on the east side of the village. The north side of the site is bounded by Parr Lane, the west side by existing residential properties, to the south by a playing field and the west by an open field separated from the site by a ditch. There is a small discussed stable building in the north east corner of the site close to a field gate on Parr Lane.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

3. Outline application (with all matters reserved) for the erection of up to 33 dwellinghouses and the provision of community allotments.

RELEVANT HISTORY OF THE SITE

4. There is no planning history relevant to the current application.

REPRESENTATIONS

5. 28 objections have been received on the following grounds:
 - The land is safeguarded land under Local Plan policy BNE3 which does not support housing up until 2026 at the earliest. Allowing housing now would undermine the Local Plan process;
 - Sandringham Road is a narrow cul-de-sac unsuitable for an increase in traffic and parking. Cars already park on the road;
 - Access for emergency vehicles needs to be considered;
 - It will add to the problems with the main road running through Eccleston and the bottleneck trying to get out onto Southport Road;

- The access to the properties is shown via Sandringham Road only. It would be better for it to be shared with Richmond Road by creating a loop road through the site;
 - Noise, pollution, disturbance and traffic hazards to existing residents;
 - It will bring increased traffic, nuisance and noise;
 - It will put strain on existing services;
 - It will ruin their outlook;
 - It will be on Green Belt land;
 - Will put pressure on stretched sewer system which is not up to current standards;
 - It needs to be determined how foul sewage would be addressed without causing problems to existing residents;
 - Flooding – the drainage ditch to the east of the development has flooded into Parr Lane in the last two years;
 - Lack of educational provision in the village;
 - Lack of available health care provision in the village;
 - Restriction of the use of open space where the amenity is so scarce in the village;
 - The site has become a local haven for wildlife, with owls, bats and many species of birds accessing this ever decreasing natural environment;
 - A barn owl hunts in the field and this is an area of Great Crested Newts;
 - There are existing houses for sale and others under construction;
 - The material consideration of allotments does not balance in favour of the additional housing. Even if there is a need for them this should not be at the cost of the loss of safeguarded land;
 - Loss of agricultural land;
 - The houses would block sunlight to their garden and invade their privacy;
 - The public consultation exercise by the developer was a farce;
 - Loss of amenity to residents of Sandringham and Richmond roads;
 - Concern about finished site level;
 - Pedestrian access onto Parr Lane could be greatly enhanced for residents of any new development by including a footpath access directly onto Parr Lane.
 - Would it increase flooding as rainwater from the site has flooded their garage a number of times;
 - Sandringham Road is heavily used by cyclists and no provision is made to segregate them from road traffic;
 - The allotments will more than likely turn out to be an eyesore and look out of place in a village setting;
6. 3 letters of support has been received on the following grounds:
- They commend the proposal for smaller, more affordable housing but do note that perhaps 33 dwellings are too many for this particular plot given the access roads to it. Revised plans with fewer dwellings may perhaps be a reasonable compromise;
 - They strongly support the proposal to include community allotments within the development as no such facility currently exists within the village;
 - They couldn't afford to buy a house in Eccleston so more affordable housing would bring people back to the village;
 - The site has been safeguarded for development at some point so why not now when affordable housing is needed in Eccleston;
 - There is a need for smaller housing and bungalows in the village.
7. Eccleston Parish Council objects to the above application on the following grounds:
- i) The properties will place unacceptable, excessive demands on existing village infrastructure including:
 - a) an increase in vehicle movements on narrow estate roads
 - b) an increase in demand for school places
 - c) the availability of vacancies on doctors/dentists patient lists
 - d) the additional properties will result in an increased demand on drainage/sewage services
8. ii) The application is contrary to policy BNE3 (3.8) of the Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026.

9. CONSULTATIONS

LCC Highways	No objection subject to conditions. See body of the report.
LCC as Lead Local Flood Authority	No objection to the proposed development subject to the inclusion of conditions. See body of report.
Trees	G2 Recommend remove to enable development. T5 Recommend reconfigure access to property to avoid RPA of T5. H6 Hedge running along rear garden area of properties. Hedge forming a screen to the development. Consider retention. Maintenance required. T14 Recommend removal due to poor condition. T27 Recommend removal due to poor condition. T28 Recommend removal due to poor condition.
Council's Ecology Advisor	No objection subject to conditions securing a Landscape Plan, biodiversity enhancement and protection of nesting birds.
Environmental Health	Do not have any specific concerns regarding existing environmental sources that could cause a disturbance to the future residents. However, they would recommend that a construction management plan is developed to highlight the control measures to be adhered to in order to prevent any unnecessary disturbance to local sensitive properties while the construction activities are being carried out.
Council's Contaminated Land Officer	Request a condition in relation to ground contamination.
Police Liaison Officer	A site specific overview of crime and bespoke advice will be provided at the reserved matters stage should the application progress. Make a number of recommendations regarding the design and layout of the development.
Environment Agency	State they are not required to be consulted on this application.
United Utilities	Have no objection to the application subject to conditions.
Strategic Housing	In accordance with Core Strategy Policy 7, 35% of the dwellings are required to be affordable. This equates to 12 dwellings. 70% (8) of these should be social rented and 30% (4) should be shared ownership. In order to meet housing need the following house types should be provided on-site, based on 33 dwellings: <u>Social rented</u> 6 x 2 bed houses 2 x 3 bed houses <u>Shared ownership</u> 3 x 3 bed houses 1 x 2 bed houses
LCC as Education Authority	Request a contribution as this is a windfall site towards 6 primary school places of £85,303.86.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Principle of development

10. The application seeks outline permission for the erection of up to 33 dwellings on land allocated as Safeguarded Land (site BNE3.9) in the Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026 as defined in Policy BNE3 'Areas of Land Safeguarded for Future Development Needs'.
11. Policy BNE3 states that development other than that permissible in the Green Belt or Area of Other Open Countryside (under Policy BNE2) will not be permitted on Safeguarded Land. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy BNE3.
12. Policy BNE3 is in accordance paragraph 85 of the NPPF which states that local planning authorities should "where necessary identify in their plans areas of Safeguarded Land between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period" and "make clear that the Safeguarded Land is not allocated for development at the present time. Planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following a Local Plan review which proposes the development."

Housing Land Supply

13. The applicant argues that the housing requirement within the Local Plan is based on out of date information and the Council do not have a Framework compliant housing requirement. As a result they argue that the Council are unable to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites and the application should fall to be considered under 14 of the Framework also sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development. It states that where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. The planning statement also asserts that Core Strategy Policy 4 clearly states that the housing requirement figure is a minimum target and there is a clear objective in NPPF paragraph 47 to significantly boost the supply of housing.
14. It is not considered that the adopted housing land supply policies set out in Core Strategy Policy 1: Locating Growth, Core Strategy Policy 4: Housing Delivery and Local Plan Policy HS1: Housing Site Allocations are out of date.
15. The Core Strategy was adopted in July 2012 and is framework compliant. The housing requirement in Policy 4 was based on Regional Strategy housing figures, however the Core Strategy Inspector considered the requirement sound and stated in his report "The amount of housing proposed, together with the policies which seek suitable densities and high quality design and other relevant policies, accord with the Government's policy, set out in the Framework, of delivering a sufficient amount and wide choice of high quality homes, widening opportunities for home ownership and creating sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities. As a result, everybody should have the opportunity of living in a decent home which they can afford in a community where they want to live. In these respects the Local Plan is sound."
16. The Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026 was adopted in July 2015. Representations were received during preparation of the Local Plan that the housing requirement is not based on a robust, up to date objective assessment of need as required by the Framework. The Inspector concluded in her report that the Core Strategy target for 417 dwellings remained appropriate. She also stated "The Regional Strategy for the North West (RS) was revoked by the Secretary of State during the examination period. The impact of this on the soundness of the Plan, particularly regarding the justification for retaining the RS housing and employment targets, was consulted upon and discussed at the hearing sessions. I conclude that no soundness issues have arisen as a consequence."
17. Furthermore, in a recent appeal decision APP/N235/W/15/3007033 for up to 150 dwellings at Land at Preston Road, Grimsargh dated 9th May 2016 the Inspector concluded that the Central Lancashire Core Strategy housing policies were not out of date. She stated in paragraph 21 "I have no reason to conclude that the relevant policies for the supply of housing are out of date with respect to the strategy for the location of housing. The Core

Strategy was adopted in July 2012 in the context of the NPPF and the Local Plan was adopted as recently as July 2015.” The Chorley Local Plan was also adopted in July 2015 therefore it should be considered up to date in light of this appeal decision. The appeal was allowed due to the uncertainties surrounding the delivery of housing and the Inspector took the view that the housing land supply for Preston amounted to approximately 4.79 years. As a five year supply had not been demonstrated the Inspector concluded in accordance with paragraph 40 of the Framework that the relevant policies for the supply of housing were out of date.

18. Whilst the Council believes that these policies are not out of date and comply with paragraph 47 of the Framework, it is accepted that it is timely to review the objectively assessed housing needs and housing requirements set out in the Core Strategy. The new Strategic Housing Market Assessment is on the Council's Planning Policy web pages.

Five year supply

19. As it is considered that the Core Strategy housing requirement is not out of date the Council can demonstrate a five year supply. The Five Year Housing Supply Statement for Chorley published in September 2017 identified that there was a 8.6 year deliverable housing supply in the Borough over the period 1st April 2017 – 31st March 2022.
20. In total there are 2,702 deliverable dwellings over the five year period. 1,627 are on allocated sites with planning permission, 621 on windfall sites with planning permission and a windfall allowance of 155 dwellings has been included.
21. Development should be in accordance with s.38 (6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless there are material considerations that indicate otherwise.
22. The applicant has put forward a number of benefits they believe are material considerations that weigh in favour of the development.

Affordable Housing

23. Core Strategy policy 7 sets down the approach to the delivery of affordable and special needs housing:
24. In accordance with Core Strategy Policy 7, 35% of the dwellings are required to be affordable. This equates to 12 dwellings. 70% (8) of these should be social rented and 30% (4) should be shared ownership. In order to meet housing need the following house types should be provided on-site, based on 33 dwellings:

Social rented

6 x 2 bed houses
2 x 3 bed houses

Shared ownership

3 x 3 bed houses
1 x 2 bed houses

“Aside from rural exception sites the minimum site size threshold will be 15 dwellings (0.5 hectares or part thereof) but a lower threshold of 5 dwellings (0.15 hectares or part therefore) is required in rural areas.”

25. The adopted Central Lancashire Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document provides additional information on the delivery of affordable housing, with paragraph 34 stating:
26. *“The size of development should not be artificially reduced to reduce or eliminate the affordable housing requirement as set out in the Core Strategy and at page 5 of this document, for example by sub-dividing sites or reducing the density of all of part of a site.”*

27. This proposal should contribute towards the policy target of 35% of affordable housing with 12 of the 33 proposed units being delivered as affordable units on site to meet this target requirement, and ensuring conformity with paragraph 49 of the SPD. This affordable housing would need to be secured through a Section 106 legal agreement if the application was approved.
28. The provision of affordable housing is given some weight in favour of the proposal in the planning balance. It is noted that the applicant has proposed that this affordable housing would be in the form for which there is a local need i.e. bungalows and smaller scale housing. The housing type and size proposed is also given some positive weight in the planning balance but it is not considered that these are sufficient to outweigh the policy presumption against it.

Principal of the development conclusion

29. As well as affordable housing the applicant has put forward other material considerations in favour of the development.
30. The applicant has also put forward that the proposal would contribute to a strong competitive economy through the provision of high quality housing. This is given some, but limited weight in the planning balance.
31. They also argue that there are limited alternatives for meeting development needs as the settlement boundary of Ecclestone is tightly constrained by Green Belt and land safeguarded for future development with limited opportunities for development in the existing built up area. The three sites allocated for residential development in the Local Plan have either been developed or are under construction. It is not considered that this is given weight in favour of the planning application. The Council have a five year housing land supply and it is not considered there is an urgent need to release further land now.
32. The applicant has put forward the provision of community allotments as a factor in favour of the proposal on the grounds that in April 2010 the council produced an updated Allotments and Community Growing document showing that there is a waiting list for them of 436 people. They also state it is noted from the Council's web site that despite additional allotments plots being provided in the borough since 2010 there are still around 400 people on the waiting list and that it is taking around 5 years from joining the waiting list to being allocated an allotment plot. Also, as part the public consultation exercise carried out by the applicant prior to submission of this application 17 respondents expressed an interest in taking one of the proposed allotments.
33. The Council's Parks and Open Spaces Officer advises that the current council allotment waiting list contains a total of 123 residents of which only 3 are Ecclestone residents. The introduction of further allotment sites since 2010 along with increasing the number of available plots, through subdivision of larger plots when they become available, has gone a considerable way to addressing the demand which existed in 2010 and significantly reducing the waiting list from 436 to 123. Large independently managed sites in Coppull and at Cuerden Park have also come forward since 2010 which has assisted in finding allotments for residents who were previously on the waiting list. They note that the council's website does require updating to reflect this situation.
34. There is no identified strategic need for allotments in Ecclestone, evidenced by the lack of an allotments allocation in Ecclestone within the local plan so there is no policy requirement to provide allotment provision on site within this development. Allotments are planned borough wide within a reasonable driving distance for residents of 10 minutes. Allotments are planned for at a new site at Land East of Station Road, Croston (HW5.4) and the development is expected to contribute towards this site.
35. Therefore although the provision of allotments is given some weight in the planning balance, it is not considered significant.

36. It is not considered that either individually or collectively that these material considerations outweigh the policy presumption against the application.

Layout, Appearance, Scale and Landscaping

37. Policy BNE1 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026 states that planning permission will be granted for new development, including extensions, conversions and free standing structures, provided that the proposal does not have a significantly detrimental impact on the surrounding area by virtue of its density, siting, layout, building to plot ratio, height, scale and massing, design, orientation and use of materials.
38. The layout, appearance, scale and landscaping aspects of the proposal do not form part of this outline application and would follow at any Reserved Matters stage. From the indicative layout plan submitted, it is considered that adequate residential curtilage would be provided with adequate space for parking and general amenity. It is considered that the dwellings could be designed without detriment to the appearance of the site, the character of the street scene or residential amenity from privacy, light or outlook. Nevertheless, this could only be fully assessed at Reserved Matters stage.
39. With regards to amenity, during the construction phase, the Council's Environmental Health Team has responded to state that it has no objection to the proposed development, however if the application is approved the construction phase should comply with the Chorley Council document "Code of Practice for Construction and Demolition" which covers acceptable working hours, noise, vibration, dust and air pollution. Any impacts during the construction phase would be temporary and suitable mitigation measures could be imposed by planning condition.
40. In light of the above, it is considered that sufficient information has been provided for the council to be satisfied that the proposed development could comply with policy BNE1 of the Local Plan at any Reserved Matters stage.

Highways, Access and Parking

41. Lancashire Highway Services has provided a detailed response which addresses the concerns expressed by representors and concludes that the development is acceptable in principle, subject to a number of conditions.
42. 30 of the dwellings would be accessed from Sandringham Road while 3 dwellings would be accessed from Parr Lane. The community allotment would be accessed from Richmond Road. LCC Highways state it is apparent from public comments provided on the planning application that residents of the area are concerned about the impact the proposal would have on the existing highway network which are legitimate concerns, however LCC must remain impartial and only assess the proposal against highway policies, current guidance and standards, evidence and transport studies. In this regard, the applicant's submissions have been carefully studied and a site visit undertaken to access the proposal.
43. It is accepted that suitability of access arrangements is an important consideration for development proposals, therefore, while the highway authority's preference would have been for the entire residential development to be accessed from Parr Lane, it is not considered that accessing the 30-dwellings from Sandringham Road as proposed will significantly impact the highway network. Sandringham Road, Winsor Road and Lawrence Lane would form the routes to and from the site are urban, single 2-way local access roads. They have 20mph speed limits and are of standard widths, sufficient to accommodate refuse lorries and large service vehicles and have good quality footways of adequate width on both sides. The existing width of Sandringham Road will be continued into the proposed development.
44. There have been no recorded traffic incidents on these roads and indeed Parr Lane in the past 5 years and although parking currently takes place on both sides of these residential roads, footways largely remain unobstructed. The applicant's estimation of trips to be generated by the proposed development seems more concentrated on Parr Lane, however, some trips will be via Winsor Road and Lawrence Road. The applicant's estimate shows that

the proposal would result in 17 two-way traffic movements being generated during the AM and PM peaks. This would undoubtedly result in higher traffic flows on the highway network, however, it is not considered the impact due to the increased flows would adversely affect the operation of the local highway network. As such, the highway authority does not object to the proposed 30-dwellings being accessed from Sandringham Road.

45. To improve accessibility for pedestrians, the applicant proposes to provide a 2m wide footpath from the end of the existing footway on the north side of Richmond Road into the development. While this seems acceptable, it is considered residents would be better served if a 3.0m wide pedestrian/cyclist link is provided instead. This should therefore be incorporated in any future Reserved Matters application in order to be accepted. For the same reason of improved accessibility and sustainability, pedestrian/cyclist link provision would be required from the development to Parr Lane in any future submission.
46. The distance from the proposed development to the nearest bus stop in this area should generally be 400m maximum, but the nearest bus stop to the site are those outside and opposite 196 The Green, approximately 650m from the site. It is not considered that accessibility by public transport is sufficiently demonstrated. However, as the bus stops are direct from the site and there are adequate and good quality infrastructure in the area for walking, coupled with street lighting, additional measures would not be required from the applicant in respect of public transport.
47. Although the submitted site layout is only indicative at this stage it is acceptable in principle subject to some minor alterations being made. For the layout of the 3 bungalows to be accessed from Parr Lane to be acceptable the footway in front of the adjacent property, 'Scalewood' must be extended across the proposed site frontage. This could be secured through a Section 278 agreement of the Highways Act 1980.
48. Overall, the proposed development is considered acceptable in principle from highways perspective, subject to the following conditions.
49. Policy ST4 'Parking Standards' of the Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026 requires that proposals for development will need to make parking provision in accordance with the standards set out in Appendix A of the Local Plan. Appendix A identifies the Council's minimum parking standards for new development. It is not currently known how many bedrooms would be provided within each dwelling. It is considered that there is sufficient room on-site for the provision of parking spaces to accord with policy ST4 at Reserved Matters stage and their provision could be secured by a planning condition.
50. The Framework is clear at paragraph 32 that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe. This is not considered to be the case in this instance. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of access and parking.

Flood Risk

51. The site is in Flood Zone 1 (the lowest risk category). As the site is over 1 hectare however a Flood Risk Assessment is required and has been submitted with the application.
52. It is evident from the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy, June 2017 that the applicant intends to discharge surface water to the existing ordinary watercourse that runs along the site's eastern boundary. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a Sustainable Urban Drainage approach (SuDS): Generally, the aim should be to discharge surface run off as high up the following hierarchy of drainage options as reasonably practicable:

- into the ground (infiltration);
- to a surface water body;
- to a surface water sewer, highway drain, or another drainage system;
- to a combined sewer.

53. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires that surface water arising from a developed site should, as far as it is practicable, be managed in a sustainable manner to mimic surface water flows arising from the site prior to the proposed development, whilst reducing flood risk to the site itself and elsewhere, taking climate change into account.
54. Lancashire County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) encourages that site surface water drainage is designed in line with the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems and Planning Practice Guidance, including restricting developed discharge of surface water to greenfield runoff rates making suitable allowances for climate change and urban creep, managing surface water as close to the surface as possible and prioritising infiltration as a means of surface water disposal where possible.
55. Regardless of the site's status as greenfield or brownfield land, the Lead Local Flood Authority encourages that surface water discharge from the developed site should be as close to the greenfield runoff rate as is reasonably practicable in accordance with Standard 2 and Standard 3 of the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems. Sustainable drainage systems offer significant advantages over conventional piped drainage systems in reducing flood risk by attenuating the rate and quantity of surface water run-off from a site, promoting groundwater recharge absorbing diffuse pollutants and improving water quality. Ponds, reed beds and seasonally flooded grasslands can be particularly attractive features within public open space. The wide variety of available sustainable drainage techniques means that virtually any development should be able to include a scheme based around these principles and provide multiple benefits, reducing costs and maintenance needs.
56. No geotechnical survey has been undertaken of the site at this stage so it is unknown whether infiltration techniques will prove feasible. The applicant is reminded that Paragraph 103 of the NPPF requires priority use to be given to SuDS and in accordance with Paragraph 80, Section 10 of the Planning Practice Guidance the preferred means of surface water drainage for any new development is via infiltration. The applicant must submit evidence as to why each 'level' of this hierarchy cannot be achieved. Prior to designing site surface water drainage for the site, a full ground investigation should be undertaken to fully explore the option of ground infiltration to manage the surface water in preference to discharging to a surface water body, sewer system or other means.
57. Therefore the LLFA have no objection to the proposed development subject to the inclusion of a condition that a surface water drainage scheme be submitted for approval which shall include discharge rates and volumes (both pre and post development), temporary storage facilities and demonstrate that the surface water run-off must not exceed the existing greenfield rate.
58. They also ask for conditions securing the completion of the drainage scheme prior to occupation of any of the dwellings and long term management and maintenance of the drainage scheme.
59. Subject to conditions in line with those requested by the LLFA the application is considered acceptable in relation to flood risk.

Public Open Space

60. Local Plan Policy HS4A - Open Space Requirements in New Housing Developments explains that all new housing developments will be required to make provision for open space and recreation facilities, where there are identified local deficiencies in the quantity, accessibility or quality and/or value of open space and recreation facilities. The requirements for the proposed development are as follows:

Amenity Greenspace

61. Local Plan Policy HS4A sets a standard of 0.73 hectares per 1,000 population. There is currently a deficit of provision in Ecclestone in relation to this standard, a contribution towards new provision in the settlement is therefore required from this development. As the

development is 10 or more dwellings the required amenity greenspace should be provided on-site. The amount required is 0.058 hectares. A maintenance cost of £23,100 is also required for a 10 year period if private maintenance is not proposed.

Provision for children/young people

62. Local Plan Policy HS4A sets a standard of 0.08 hectares per 1,000 population. There is currently a surplus of provision in Ecclestone in relation to this standard, a contribution towards new provision in the settlement is therefore not required from this development. The site is also not within the accessibility catchment (800m) of any areas of provision for children/young people that are identified as being low quality and/or low value in the Open Space Study. A contribution towards improvements is therefore also not required from this development.

Parks and Gardens

63. There is no requirement to provide a new park or garden on-site within this development.
64. There are no parks/gardens within the accessibility catchment (1,000m) of this site identified as being low quality and/or low value in the Open Space Study therefore a contribution towards improving existing provision is not required.

Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace

65. There is no requirement to provide new natural/semi natural greenspace on-site within this development.
66. The site is within the accessibility catchment (800m) of areas of natural/semi-natural greenspace that are identified as being low quality and/or low value in the Open Space Study (Rear of Larkfield), a contribution towards improving these sites is therefore required. The amount required is £557 per dwelling.

Allotments

67. There is no requirement to provide allotment provision on site within this development.
68. The site is within the accessibility catchment (10 minutes' drive time) of a proposed new allotment site at Land East of Station Road, Croston (HW5.4). A contribution towards new allotment provision is therefore required from this development. The amount required is £15 per dwelling.

Playing Pitches

69. A Playing Pitch Strategy was published in June 2012 which identifies a Borough wide deficit of playing pitches but states that the majority of this deficit can be met by improving existing pitches. A financial contribution towards the improvement of existing playing pitches is therefore required from this development. The Playing Pitch Strategy includes an Action Plan which identifies sites that need improvements. The amount required is £1,599 per dwelling.

70. The total financial contribution required from this development is as follows:
- | | |
|----------------------|--|
| Amenity greenspace | = £0 A maintenance cost of £23,100 is also required for a 10 year period if private maintenance is not proposed. |
| Equipped play area | = £0 |
| Parks/Gardens | = £0 |
| Natural/semi-natural | = £18,381 |
| Allotments | = £495 |
| Playing Pitches | = £52,767 |
| Total | = £71,643 (maintenance cost of £23,100 also required for 10 year period if private maintenance is not proposed) |

71. This would need to be secured through a Section 106 legal agreement if the application was approved.

Trees and Ecology

72. The Greater Manchester Ecological Unit (the Council's ecology advisor) has reviewed the applicant's ecological assessment and concluded that the proposal is acceptable, subject to conditions.
73. They state the field could best be described as semi-improved or improved species-poor neutral grassland, currently of limited ecological value. There are features with rather more nature conservation interest present, including scattered broadleaved trees, hedgerows, marshy grassland, scrub vegetation and a small stream. All of these habitat features are on the boundaries of the site and are capable of being retained as part of the scheme. Providing these boundary habitats are retained and protected or improved, habitat losses to the scheme will be limited to the loss of the grassland, although of course the development will result in a loss of the 'openness' of the site and a degree of habitat fragmentation.
74. The potential of the site to support any specially protected species is low, although small numbers of foraging bats may make use of the site. Bat foraging habitats are capable of being retained. A couple of trees considered to have some potential to support roosting bats are capable of being retained as part of the scheme. If these trees are later scheduled for removal then they should be inspected for the possible presence of bats prior to any tree works commencing.
75. They recommended conditions securing a Landscape Plan, biodiversity enhancement and protection of nesting birds.
76. Several trees would require removal as part of the development however all of them are low quality Category C trees. Landscaping of the site would be a Reserved Matter if the application was approved and could therefore be controlled at this stage.

Education Contribution

77. Request a contribution towards 6 primary school places of £85,303.86. As this is a windfall site, rather than an allocated housing site in the Local Plan it is considered that this would need to be secured through a Section 106 legal agreement if the application was approved.

Community Infrastructure Levy

78. The Chorley CIL Infrastructure Charging Schedule provides a specific amount for development. The CIL Charging Schedule was adopted on 16 July 2013 and charging commenced on 1 September 2013. The proposed development will be a chargeable development and the charge is subject to indexation in accordance with the Council's Charging Schedule.
79. If approved this development will be CIL Liable on approval of the final Reserved Matter.

CONCLUSION

80. The proposed development would be located mostly within an area of Safeguarded Land as defined by the Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026. The Council has a five year housing land supply as required by the National Planning Policy Framework. The proposal therefore conflicts with policy BNE3 'Areas of Land Safeguarded for Future Development Needs' of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026. It is not considered that the material considerations put forward in favour of the development, either individually or collectively, are sufficient to outweigh the presumption against it. Therefore it is therefore contrary to the Framework and Chorley Local Plan in respect of Policy BNE3 and it is recommended that the application for outline permission is refused.

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.

Reasons for refusal

The proposed development would be located within an area of Safeguarded Land as defined by the Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026. The Council has a five year housing land supply as required by the National Planning Policy Framework. The proposal therefore conflicts with policy BNE3 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026. It is not considered that the material considerations put forward in favour of the development, either individually or collectively, outweigh the policy presumption against it. The application is therefore contrary to the Framework and Chorley Local Plan in respect of Policy BNE3.