

**Item 11**                      **09/00053/FUL**                      **Refuse Full Planning Permission**

**Case Officer**                      **Caron Taylor**

**Ward**                                      **Brindle And Hoghton**

**Proposal**                              **Retrospective application to retain 4 no. lighting columns.**

**Location**                              **The Boatyard Inn Bolton Road Withnell ChorleyPR6 8BP**

**Applicant**                              **Mr Michael Pozzi**

**The application has been brought to the Chariman's briefing as it is retrospective and has been recommended for refusal.**

**Consultation expiry: 26<sup>th</sup> February 2009**  
**Application expiry: 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2009**

**Proposal**                              The application is retrospective to retain 4 lighting columns.

**Summary**                              Low level lighting columns were permitted to a new overflow car park by permission 07/00794/FUL, however these have not been implemented and four high level lighting columns erected without planning permission. External lighting is considered necessary and reasonable at the Inn but the type of lighting that is the subject of this application is considered excessive for what is required and will have a detrimental impact on the Green Belt and the rural character of the area contrary to Policy EP21A of the Local Plan, especially as there is no street lighting on this part of Bolton Road.

If the applicant wished to provide more lighting than previously approved it is considered that the Council would be able to support the introduction of more low level bollard type lighting as permitted on the new overflow car park, as it would be more appropriate to the area as well as being sufficient to ensure the safety of staff and visitors to the Inn.

**Policies**                              PPG2: Green Belts  
DC1: Development in the Green Belt  
EP21A: Light Pollution

**Planning History**                      The recent planning history of the site is as follows:

**Ref:** 94/00707/FUL  
**Decision:** PERFPP  
**Decision Date:** 1 December 1994  
**Description:** Single Storey Side Extension and Erection of Porch o Rear.

**Ref:** 04/00582/FUL  
**Decision:** PERFPP  
**Decision Date:** 16 July 2004  
**Description:** Internal alterations and extension to existing public house,

**Ref:** 04/01062/ADV  
**Decision:** PERADV  
**Decision Date:** 19 November 2004  
**Description:** Retrospective application for 4 advertisement signs,

**Ref:** 04/01063/ADV  
**Decision:** PERADV  
**Decision Date:** 19 November 2004  
**Description:** Retrospective application for 2 post signs,

**Ref:** 07/00205/FUL  
**Decision:** PERFPP  
**Decision Date:** 9 May 2007  
**Description:** Proposed front extension to include glazed shelter and extended patio area

**Ref:** 07/00430/FUL      **Decision:** PERFPP  
**Decision Date:** 20 June 2007  
**Description:** Proposed conversion of outbuilding into hotel rooms.

**Ref:** 07/00794/FUL  
**Decision:** PERFPP  
**Decision Date:** 19 October 2007  
**Description:** Additional car parking (37 spaces) with 4no. lighting columns.

## **Background**

The lighting columns have already been erected and therefore the application is retrospective. There are four columns, two serving the new overflow car park permitted by 07/00794/FUL, one on the new access road up to the car park and one onto to the rear of the Inn facing towards the slipway.

Low-level bollard lighting was permitted to the overflow car park by permission 07/00794/FUL however, these were not implemented and the lighting columns the subject of this application erected.

## **Consultations**

None received at time of writing

## **Representations**

None received at time of writing

## **Applicant's Case**

The agent states that they did not obtain the original planning permission for the overflow car park and were unaware of the lighting that had been approved by that scheme. The car park is in a remote site and of an open nature and it was felt necessary for the three lights to be provided to this area for the safety of customers to protect them from falling and secondly from a security aspect in what would otherwise be a dark remote area.

One of the lights is also used to illuminate the access coming out of the top car park and its junction with the existing car park. The lights are pointed down and do not illuminate beyond the edge of the site. The column to the rear of the Inn was added to cover the steps to the entrance and provide illumination to a remote car parking area. The lux levels could be changed and a timer attached. It is from a point of view of safety and security that the client wishes to maintain the lighting.

## **Assessment**

The Boatyard Inn is in the Green Belt. Policy EP21A states the criteria that lighting schemes should meet, including that the amount of lighting is the minimum required for security and public safety, light spillage is minimised and that there will be no nuisance to neighbours or adverse effect on the character of the area. The principle of lighting at the site is considered acceptable as is shown by the permission for the car park that allowed low-level bollard lighting, which was considered to meet these criteria. The high level lighting is however considered excessive for what is necessary. The Boatyard Inn is located in the Green Belt and the site has a strong rural feel with no street lighting on Bolton Road. Although there is some canal side lighting these are much lower lantern style columns. The lights applied for introduce a block of light that would undermine the character of the rural area and have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the Green Belt.

It is the type of lighting that is applied for that is considered unacceptable. If the applicant wished to install more low level lighting bollards as those permitted on the new overflow car park around other areas of the site, these would be more appropriate and ensure the safety of staff and visitors to the Inn and is considered they could be supported by the Council if they were applied for.

**Recommendation Refuse**

**Recommendation: Refuse Full Planning Permission**

## **Reasons**

1. The site is in the Green Belt and the area has a strong rural character. It is considered that the type of lighting proposed is above the minimum required for security and public safety and the proposal is therefore considered contrary to Policy EP21A of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review. The lights would introduce a block of light that would undermine the character of the rural area and have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the Green Belt contrary to PPG2: Green Belts.
-