

APPLICATION REPORT – 17/01038/FUL

Validation Date: 30 October 2017

Ward: Euxton South

Type of Application: Full Planning

Proposal: Erection of extension to existing stable building, provision of horse walker and midden and extension to concrete hard surfacing (retrospective)

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

Case Officer: Mr Iain Crossland

Applicant: C/O Agent

Agent: Mr David Forshaw

Consultation expiry: 24 November 2017

Decision due by: 25 December 2017

RECOMMENDATION

1. It is recommended that planning permission is granted subject to conditions.

SITE DESCRIPTION

2. The site of Gleadhill House Stud is located in the Green Belt to the west of Euxton with an existing access to Dawbers Lane. It comprises a large building that provides stabling and storage adjacent to a horse trotting track. To the east of the site is Euxton Park Care Home, Euxton Park Hospital and the Millenium Green whilst to the south is a former area of the stud that is being developed with houses. To the west of the existing complex are open fields, used by the stud for grazing and bound by the M6 motorway.
3. The wider site is defined by the woodland belts and there is a public footpath that extends from the A49 westwards past the site to the south joining Dawbers Lane close to the M6.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

4. The application seeks planning permission retrospectively for the erection of an extension to the existing stables building, the use of land for the siting of a horse walker, erection of a walled enclosure to form a midden and extension to the existing area of concrete hard surfacing.

REPRESENTATIONS

5. No representations have been received.

CONSULTATIONS

6. **Euxton Parish Council:** Comment that they opposed the applicant's recent proposal to demolish Gleadhill House and construct self-build houses in the Green Belt, extending beyond the previous limits of development into the open fields. The Parish Council was

disappointed that the Borough Council's planning officers saw fit to recommend the development and that the Development Control Committee decided to approve it. At the time the Parish Council considered this to be a rather cavalier approach, by both applicant and the Borough Council, to protecting Euxton's fragile and vulnerable Green Belt.

7. This new application suggests that the applicant remains rather unconcerned for the Green Belt and the Parish Council has the following comments.
 - The applicant, an experienced developer, implemented the development without seeking the necessary approvals.
 - Now that an application has been submitted, when prompted by the Borough Council, it makes no mention of the Green Belt and does not attempt to justify it in that context.
 - Whilst development for agriculture might be appropriate in the Green Belt, equestrian use is not agricultural use - there is a need to explain why these works are appropriate 'and justify special circumstances' to develop in the Green Belt.
 - When the Gleadhill House application (16/00663) was made the applicant stated, in the amended planning statement, that "The intention is to relocate the business and staff to an existing complex of barns and buildings in the same ownership approximately 200metres to the rear. The stud will utilise existing buildings resulting therefore in no new buildings". In view of this new application the Parish Council feels that the earlier application was misleading in terms of the total impact of the development upon the Green Belt (and allowing for the fact that the horse walker was a previously existing building albeit in a different location).
8. The Parish Council accepts that this proposal would not have a major impact upon the Green Belt. It is a relatively small additional development alongside a large stable building associated with the applicant's equestrian business. Nevertheless, the Parish Council considers that the applicant should show the respect due to the Euxton Green Belt by submitting a fully worked application and that the Borough Council should refuse the current application and only accept a future application if it can be fully justified as development within the Green Belt.
9. The Parish Council would request that this application be referred to the development Control Committee and not delegated to officers for decision.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Principle of development in the Green Belt

10. The application site is a commercial stud facility and as such is previous developed land located in the Green Belt. The National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) states that there is a general presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt and The Framework advises that when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt.
11. 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.*
12. In relation to the proposed erection of the extension to the building, Paragraph 89 of the Framework states that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new

buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. There are a number of exceptions to inappropriate development. One exception is the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

13. Whether the proposed extension would result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building is a subjective judgment. Objective criteria could include the volume of the existing building although it is important to note that the Framework does not include such an allowance or capacity test. The proposed extension is of a lower height, much smaller footprint and is of a significantly lesser volume by comparison with the building to which it is attached. As such it could not be considered disproportionate and does not, therefore, represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
14. In relation to the use of land for the siting of the horse walker, erection of a walled enclosure to form a midden and extension to the existing area of concrete hard surfacing the Framework sets out a number of other exceptions to inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Paragraph 90 of the Framework states that:
Certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate in Green Belt provided they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belt. These are:
 - *mineral extraction;*
 - *engineering operations;*
 - *local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location;*
 - *the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction; and*
 - *development brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order.*
15. The area of hardstanding comprises a 435m.sq. concrete pad. This represents an engineering operation and has enabled the siting of the horse walker and access to it and the provision of a midden. The horse walker is a steel mesh structure with a canopy over the outer circumference to cover exercising horses. It is not a building but is a piece of plant/equipment associated with the principal land use. It is a moveable structure rather than a building and has been recently transferred from another part of the Gleadhill site. The midden is a three sided structure of wooden fence panels 2m in height.
16. These elements of the proposal are considered to be engineering operations in accordance with paragraph 90 of the Framework. Engineering operations are not necessarily inappropriate development within Green Belt locations providing that they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belt.
17. As such there are two considerations in respect of the proposals and the appropriateness of the development in the Green Belt as follows:
 - 1) *Will the development preserve the openness of the Green Belt?* Whilst the test for sites such as this relates to preserving openness it is important to note that the Framework contains no specific definition of 'openness'. The creation of the hardstanding effectively preserves the openness of the Green Belt. The siting of the horse walker on the concrete pad is viewed in the context of the large buildings on the site being positioned approximately 1m from the adjacent building. Given this positioning and the lightweight mesh structure, it effectively preserves the openness of the Green Belt. The enclosing structure forming the midden has the appearance of a solid fence and could be developed without the need to seek planning permission under The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, Schedule 2, Part 2, Class A, being no more than 2m in height. This does not impact on the openness of the Green Belt.
 - 2) *Will the development conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt?* Paragraph 80 of the Framework sets out the five Green Belt purposes which the scheme is assessed against as below:

Purpose 1 (to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas).

The proposals are small in scale and are contained within the site and alongside the existing buildings. The extension is a minor addition to a large building and the other structures do not result in built form. As such, the proposed development does not result in the encroachment of built development into the Green Belt.

Purpose 2 (to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another)

Development of the site would not lead to the coalescence of neighbouring towns. In respect of the neighbouring villages the development would not lead to a coalescence of neighbouring villages.

Purpose 3 (to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;).

The hardstanding amounts to approximately 435m² in area and is located immediately adjacent to the existing stud buildings. The hardstanding is a concrete pad typical of those found at agricultural holdings and is not uncommon in this context. The structures and extension are viewed in the context of the existing building. Therefore, it is not considered that the scheme represents encroachment into the countryside

Purpose 4 (to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns;).

This does not apply as the site is not located near a historical town

Purpose 5 (to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land).

It is not considered that the proposals conflict with this purpose as the proposals are not of a type that would be encouraged in urban areas, and are most suited to the countryside.

18. It is considered that the proposed development preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belt in accordance with paragraphs 89 and 90 of the Framework. The proposals do not, therefore, represent inappropriate development within this Green Belt location.

Impact on character and appearance of the locality

19. The application site is not visually prominent and is only visible from rights of way crossing land to the south, to the west and to the north. In terms of the impact on the character and appearance of the locality and the landscape in this location, the development assimilates into the existing buildings, does not appear as a prominent feature in the landscape and has only a minor visual impact from the rights of way. Furthermore, existing trees filter views of the proposed development.
20. The buildings and structures are typical of the use they are put to. As such, it is considered that the development does not have an unacceptably detrimental impact on the character of the locality.

Impact on neighbour amenity

21. The development is not visible from any nearby neighbouring properties and the midden is more than 130m from the nearest residential property. The development therefore has no impact on neighbour amenity.

CONCLUSION

22. The development is not considered to have an adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt or landscape character and there is a suitable distance between the site and the adjacent residential properties to ensure that living conditions will not suffer detrimental harm. It is, therefore, recommended that the application is approved.

RELEVANT HISTORY OF THE SITE

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

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

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: 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:** PEROPP **Decision Date:** 31 March 2017
Description: Demolition of existing buildings and erection of up to 12 detached self build houses with double garages and associated infrastructure

Ref: 17/00588/DIS **Decision:** PEDISZ **Decision Date:** 18 August 2017
Description: Application to discharge conditions 4 (phasing plan), 6 (landscaping plan) and 13 (public footpath upgrade) attached to planning permission 16/00633/OUTMAJ - Demolition of existing buildings and erection of up to 12 detached self build houses with double garages and associated infrastructure

Ref: 17/00720/DEMCON **Decision:** APPRET **Decision Date:**
Description: Application for prior determination for the proposed demolition of all buildings on site comprising Gleadhill House, stables and ancillary accommodation and stores/garages

Ref: 17/00741/DIS **Decision:** PEDISZ **Decision Date:** 2 November 2017
Description: Application to discharge condition 8 (drainage strategy) attached to planning permission 16/00633/OUTMAJ - Demolition of existing buildings and erection of up to 12 detached self build houses with double garages and associated infrastructure

Ref: 17/00806/REMMAJ **Decision:** PERRES **Decision Date:** 8 November 2017
Description: Reserved matters application pursuant to outline planning permission 16/00633/OUTMAJ for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of up to 12 detached self build houses with double garages and associated infrastructure. Details of landscaping to be considered.

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.

Suggested Conditions

No.	Condition									
1.	The development hereby permitted must only be completed in accordance with the approved plans. The approved plans are: <table border="1"><thead><tr><th>Plan Ref.</th><th>Received On</th><th>Title:</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>143-3</td><td>20 November 2017</td><td>Location plan</td></tr><tr><td>WJ_141_1</td><td>03 November 2017</td><td>Proposed plans, elevations and site layout</td></tr></tbody></table>	Plan Ref.	Received On	Title:	143-3	20 November 2017	Location plan	WJ_141_1	03 November 2017	Proposed plans, elevations and site layout
Plan Ref.	Received On	Title:								
143-3	20 November 2017	Location plan								
WJ_141_1	03 November 2017	Proposed plans, elevations and site layout								

	<i>Reason: To define the permission and in the interests of the proper development of the site.</i>
--	---