

## **APPLICATION REPORT – 21/01341/FUL**

**Validation Date: 2 December 2021**

**Ward: Adlington And Anderton**

**Type of Application: Full Planning**

**Proposal: Change of use of land to enable the siting of four shepherds huts to provide overnight wedding accommodation and associated works**

**Location: Rivington Hall Barn And Part Rivington Hall Rivington Lane Rivington Bolton BL6 7SB**

**Case Officer: Johndaniel Jaques**

**Applicant: Kevin and Matthew Salmon**

**Agent: Mr Gavin Porritt**

**Consultation expiry: 20 June 2022**

**Decision due by: 21 June 2022 (Extension of time agreed)**

---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

1. Subject to no objections being received from Historic England, that planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

### **SITE DESCRIPTION**

2. The site is a grassed area to the edge of a copse of trees, which lies within the curtilage of Rivington Hall Barn, which is a Grade II Listed Building and Rivington Hall, which is a Grade II\* Listed Building. The site also lies within Lever Park, which is a Historic Park and Garden and is an area of designated public open space. The site lies within the Green Belt. It also lies within the low and high risk coal consultation zone and bridleways run near the site.

### **DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT**

3. Change of use of land to enable the siting of four shepherds huts to provide overnight wedding accommodation and associated works. The associated works include the provision of a 1.5m wide gravel path edged with timber boarding to provide access to the huts from the car parking area. Additional tree and hedge planting in the vicinity of the site would be undertaken.

### **REPRESENTATIONS**

4. Two representations have been received which cite the following objections:
  - This could just be the beginning and more structures could appear. Access for the public could be further restricted.

- The Friends Of Lever Park were not notified, the public's rights of way and rights to free and uninterrupted enjoyment of the park as set out in bye-laws and Acts would be impeded.

## **CONSULTATIONS**

5. Rivington Parish Council – Object on the basis that if the application is approved it would set a precedent for further accommodation premises. Rivington Parish is very unique and the legacy given by Lord Leverhulme is a priority that the Parish Council will uphold before a profit making venture based on overnight accommodation within the boundaries of Lever Park.
6. Growth Lancashire – No objections.
7. Greater Manchester Ecology Unit – No objections.
8. The Gardens Trust – No comments received.
9. Lancashire Gardens Trust – No comments received.
10. Lancashire Highway Services – No objections.
11. Historic England – Comments awaited.
12. Friends Of Lever Park – object on the basis they were not notified, the public's rights of way and rights to free and uninterrupted enjoyment of the park as set out in bye-laws and Acts would be impeded.

## **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

### Principle of the development and impact on the Green Belt

13. Paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. At a very high level, the objective of sustainable development can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
14. Paragraph 8 of the Framework sets out that achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways (so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different objectives):
  - a) an economic objective – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure;
  - b) a social objective – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering a well-designed and safe built environment, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being; and
  - c) an environmental objective – to contribute to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, helping to improve biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.

15. At the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development (paragraph 11).
16. For decision-taking this means:

approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or

where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless:

  - i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or
  - ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.
17. The Framework sets out (paragraph 81) that planning decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development. The approach taken should allow each area to build on its strengths, counter any weaknesses and address the challenges of the future. Paragraph 83 recognises that decisions should recognise and address the specific locational requirements of different sectors. The requirement to support a proposal that would provide jobs and other economic benefits for the area should be given weight in the planning balance.
18. Paragraphs 84 and 85 of the Framework deal with supporting a prosperous rural economy, setting out that planning policies and decisions should enable the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings. It says that it should be recognised that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. Therefore it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads and exploits any opportunities to make a location more sustainable (for example by improving the scope for access on foot, by cycling or by public transport). The use of previously developed land, should be encouraged where suitable opportunities exist.
19. The application site is located within the Green Belt and falls within the definition of previously developed land provided within the Framework as the site is within the curtilage of Rivington Hall. Section 13 of the Framework confirms that 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.
20. The Framework sets out that the Green Belt exists to achieve five purposes as set out below.

*138. Green Belt serves five purposes:*

  - a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;*
  - b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;*
  - c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;*
  - d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and*
  - e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.*
21. Development will only be permitted within the Green Belt, under certain exceptions in accordance with the Framework, except where very special circumstances can be demonstrated. The Framework confirms that 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

22. Paragraph 149 of the Framework states that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt but lists a number of exceptions. An exception relevant to this case is listed at paragraph 149 of the Framework where development may not need to be considered as inappropriate development in the Green Belt. This is:
- g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development.
23. Whilst the test for previously developed sites such as this relates to the impact on openness, the Framework does not contain a specific definition of 'openness'. It is a subjective judgment, which is considered further below, along with objective criteria in making that assessment. It is considered that in respect of the Framework, the wider existing Rivington Hall Barn And Part Rivington Hall site currently has an impact on the openness of the Green Belt. However, it is important to note that merely the presence of an existing building on the site currently does not justify any new buildings. The new buildings must also not "have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt".
24. To engage with the exceptions of paragraph 149 of the Framework, which is reflected in policy BNE5 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026, the test relates to the existing development. The openness of an area is clearly affected by the erection or positioning of any object within it no matter whether the object is clearly visible or not. The openness test relates to the whole of the site.
25. This part of Rivington is not specified as an area for growth within Core Strategy Policy 1 and falls to be considered as an 'other place'. Criterion (f) of Core Strategy Policy 1 reads as follows:
- "In other places – smaller villages, substantially built up frontages and Major Developed Sites – development will typically be small scale and limited to appropriate infilling, conversion of buildings and proposals to meet local need, unless there are exceptional reasons for larger scale redevelopment schemes."
26. The proposed development is considered to be small scale and meets a local need therefore it complies with this this policy.
27. Policy BNE5 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026 relates to the redevelopment of previously developed sites in the Green Belt and states that redevelopment of previously developed sites in the Green Belt will be permitted providing that 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.
28. Whether harm is caused to openness depends on a variety of factors, such as the scale of the development, its locational context and its spatial and/or visual implications. At present, the site is occupied by a building. The presence of this existing development already causes harm to openness by its mere existence; and case law has established that for there to be a greater impact, there must be something more than merely a change.
29. In volumetric terms, as there are no buildings on the part of the site on which the shepherds huts would be position. The proposed shepherds huts, whilst not buildings, would have a volume of 51 cubic metres each, so the proposal would involve the permanent positioning of shepherds hut trailers that involve the presence of volume from the currently open site.
30. When considering this impact on openness it is clear that the presence of the shepherds huts would have both a spatial and visual impact on the openness of the site. Although the huts would be sheltered by trees and hedges, which would filter views and lessen the visual

impact they would remain visible within the landscape, particularly in winter, and therefore a visual impact on openness is unavoidable.

31. As a result the proposed development would result in definitional harm to the Green Belt therefore any other harm caused by the development must also be considered and added to the definitional harm. Although the applicant submits that the proposal would have no greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt, there would also be harm to openness through the siting of four shepherds huts on the land.
32. Consideration must also be given to whether the development would conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. The purposes are set out in the Framework at paragraph 138. The development would be contained within the curtilage of the site and would not conflict with any of the purposes set out at paragraph 138.
33. Overall, it is considered that the proposed development would result in definitional harm to the Green Belt and harm to openness. Such development should not be approved except in 'Very Special Circumstances', which will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
34. It is not considered that there is any other harm that would weigh against the proposal as set out by paragraph 148 of the Framework.
35. The proposed pathway and any excavation associated with providing water to the huts and drainage from them is considered to be an engineering operation in accordance with paragraph 150 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 within Green Belt.
36. As such there are two considerations in respect of the proposal and the appropriateness of the development in the Green Belt as follows:
  - 1) Will the development preserve the openness of the Green Belt?
37. 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'. It is noted that the pathway itself is a low lying surface structure, and in this respect does not have a physical impact on openness due to its two dimensional nature.
  - 2) Will the development conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt?
38. Paragraph 138 of the Framework sets out the five Green Belt purposes, which the scheme is assessed against as below:
39. Purpose 1 (to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas).  
The proposal does not relate to a large built up area.
40. Purpose 2 (to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another)  
The development would not lead to the coalescence of neighbouring towns.
41. Purpose 3 (to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;).  
The pathway would link into an existing hard surface at its northern end and would be 1.5m wide. It would be constructed from gravel with timber edgings and would not have formal kerb edgings in the way that an access road/track may. This design and the lack of kerb edgings or other paraphernalia to the path itself would result in a rural low key appearance that would blend in with its surroundings. Given the simple construction and materials it is considered that the path would, on balance retain the characteristics of a rural pathway would not result in harmful encroachment into the Green Belt.
42. 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.

43. Purpose 5 (to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land).  
It is not considered that the proposal conflicts with this purpose.
44. The new pathway would effectively preserve the openness of the Green Belt, given the simple low level surfacing and lack of formal kerb edgings, there would be no conflict with any of the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. Therefore it would accord with paragraph 150 of the Framework.
45. The application site is within an area of designated public open space, which comprises a large area of land known as Lever Park. As such consideration must be given to the protections provided by policy HW2 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026. In this instance the application site occupies only a very small proportion of the open space and is an area of land that may be accessed by the public on an informal basis, though in reality is little used. Notwithstanding this the proposal is for the use of the land for the siting of shepherds huts trailers, which are by their nature moveable, being wheeled structures. As such the nature of the land itself would not alter, whilst there is no proposal to restrict public access, which could in theory continue in the same way as it does currently. As such the proposed development would not have any discernible impact on the recreational capacity of Lever Park and would not lead to any loss of the open space. The visual impact of the proposal on the character of the area is considered below.

#### Impact on Listed Buildings

46. The principle statutory duty under Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is to preserve the special character of heritage assets, including their setting.
47. Chapter 16 of the Framework sets out considerations relating to conserving and enhancing the historic environment.
48. Paragraph 199 states that when considering the impact of proposals on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be applied. This is irrespective of whether any harm is identified as being substantial, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.
49. Paragraph 200 states that any harm or loss of significance to a designated asset should require clear and convincing justification.
50. Paragraph 202 identifies that where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
51. Policy 16 of the Core Strategy and Policy BNE8 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 -2026 deal with Heritage Assets.
52. The key issues to consider are whether or not the proposed development would harm the relationship/setting to the Grade II\* listed Rivington Hall and the Grade II listed Rivington Barn and Part Rivington Hall. And whether the proposal would have a harmful impact on Lever Park, which is a Registered Park and Garden (Grade II).
53. With the additional planting of trees and hedging as proposed the harm caused to the setting of the Listed Buildings and Lever Park is considered negligible.
54. As such the proposal is considered to meet the statutory test 'to preserve' the significance of the designated heritage assets, subject to the implementation of landscaping, which it is

recommended should be secured by condition. The proposal meets the statutory duty contained in the principle Act and the objectives of Chapter 16 of the Framework and accords with Policy EN8 of the Local Plan and Policy 16 of the Central Lancashire Core Strategy.

#### Impact on highways safety

55. Policy BNE1 (Design Criteria for New Development) of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 -2026 stipulates that planning permission will be granted for new development, including extensions, conversions and free standing structures, provided that the residual cumulative highways impact of the development is not severe and it would not prejudice highway safety, pedestrian safety, the free flow of traffic, and would not reduce the number of on-site parking spaces to below the standards stated in Site Allocations Policy – Parking Standards, unless there are other material considerations which justify the reduction.
56. Lancashire County Council Highways (LCC) consider that the proposal is acceptable and it is not considered that additional car parking to serve the shepherds huts would be required given the existing parking provision serving the hotel which has a large dedicated car park
57. LCC advise that they have no objection to the proposed scheme and it is considered that the proposed development would not have a significant impact on highway safety, capacity or amenity in the immediate vicinity of the site. It would not affect public rights of way/bridleways as raised by objectors. The proposal is, therefore, considered to be acceptable in highways safety terms and in accordance with Chorley Local Plan policies BNE1 (d) and HS9 (g).

#### Impact on the character of the area

58. The proposed development seeks to use the land for the siting of four shepherds huts. The huts consist of trailers measuring 2.9m by 6.1m with a height of approximately 3.5m. They are timber clad with a corrugated metal barrel roof, and have an 'olde worlde' appearance. The only operational development involved would be the construction of an access track and the installation of services.
59. The site is already heavily wooded to the north, south and west, which largely screens views from these directions. To the east the site is more open and would be seen from the driveway leading to the hall, which is open to public use. It is proposed that some hedge planting is included on this side, which would help to filter views and reduce any visual impact, however, the huts would not be screened in their entirety. The appearance of the huts includes a natural finish through the use of timber cladding, which would help them to remain unobtrusive, whilst their scale is relatively modest. As a result the huts would not appear overly prominent and would not be incongruous features given the existing woodland screening and subject to the implementation of the proposed landscaping scheme. The track would be of a simple construction and would be relatively narrow, as such it would have little impact on the appearance of the site.
60. Overall the impact of the development on the appearance of the wider site would be limited and is not considered that the presence of the huts would be significantly detrimental to the character of the area.

#### Impact on the amenity of neighbours

61. Policy BNE1 (Design Criteria for New Development) of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 -2026 stipulates that planning permission will be granted for new development, including extensions, conversions and free standing structures, provided that, where relevant to the development the proposal would not cause harm to any neighbouring property by virtue of overlooking, overshadowing, or by creating an overbearing impact; and that the proposal would not cause an unacceptable degree of noise disturbance to surrounding land uses.

62. The proposal would not have any impact on the amenity of neighbours given that there are no residential properties in close proximity to the site, and the nearest buildings are not in residential use.
63. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development would, by virtue of the location and design, not have an adverse impact on the amenity currently enjoyed by any residential properties.

#### Impact on ecological interests

64. Policy BNE9 (Biodiversity and Nature Conservation) of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026 stipulates that Biodiversity and Ecological Network resources will be protected, conserved, restored and enhanced; and that priority will be given to, among other things, protecting, safeguarding and enhancing habitats for European, nationally and locally important species.
65. An ecological appraisal of the site has been carried out by Greenscape Environmental (Reference PEA 22-01 004.1 – 15th February 2022). This sets out that the site lies within 10 metres of the nearest Biological Heritage Site which is Lever Park, but the site contains a significantly less diverse range of plant species than the BHS. There would be no impact on nesting birds as no trees are to be removed, and no roost features for bats are to be directly impacted by the development. However, it is recommended that bat roost boxes are installed. External lighting may reduce dark corridors for bats within the woodland and therefore recommendations regarding controlling lighting are made and those are to be controlled by an appropriately worded condition.
66. Whilst the site offers high value habitat to newts and the pond nearest the site may be suitable for them due to the conditions around the pond and the nature of the proposal, the appraisal concluded no impacts on newts are expected. Therefore no further consideration is necessary.
67. There would be no major impacts on trees, however a suitable condition can ensure that if works do go into root protection areas, that they comply with the relevant British Standard.
68. Given the above, it is not considered that the proposal would be detrimental to nature conservation interests and would accord with policy BNE9 of the Chorley Local Plan.

#### Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

69. 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 would not be CIL liable or chargeable.

#### Coal Risk

70. Although part of the site lies in the High Risk Coal Referral Area, it is not considered that the proposal would be likely to be affected by this given the nature of the proposals which involves siting of shepherds huts and the installation of an access path. Notwithstanding this, an informative is recommended to make the applicant aware of it.

#### Green Belt balancing exercise

71. The applicant has put forward a number of circumstances for consideration in the assessment of the proposal.
72. Rivington Hall and Hall Barn has hosted weddings for many years and has these have been a key part of the business. More recently, since the introduction of licences for civil ceremonies, the Hall Barn has been the chosen venue for many marriages, with permission being granted to allow the refurbishment of part of Rivington Hall to create a bridal



preparation area. The proposed shepherds huts are required to enable the business to offer overnight accommodation to a small number of wedding guests who may wish to stay overnight before or after a wedding.

73. The wedding market is constantly changing and it is becoming increasingly clear from prospective customers that overnight accommodation onsite, for at least the core guests, is now a major requirement. Many potential wedding parties will not consider the venue because overnight accommodation is not currently available. Given that most, if not all, of the venue's major competitors offer overnight accommodation, this currently undermines the business to a significant degree. Without overnight accommodation, it is expected that the venue would become less attractive, resulting in a decline in business that would affect the viability of the business. Without the wedding operations provided by the business there would be no apparent meaningful use for Rivington Hall, which would put a grade II\* listed building at risk.
74. Whilst other accommodation may be available in the area, it is not always available nor is it always of the required standard, and is not within the expectation of many prospective wedding parties. Options for high quality accommodation of the type sought for bridal parties are quite limited in the area, and by providing overnight accommodation it would help to ensure the business is successful and attractive to prospective customers.
75. It is considered that the investment in proposed overnight accommodation in the form of shepherds huts would help the business to adapt and maintain its viability. Significant weight should be afforded to this in accordance the advice provided at paragraph 81 of the Framework. Clearly the somewhat isolated location of the wedding venue means that it is not easy for people to find suitable overnight accommodation nearby and in accordance with paragraph 85 of the Framework the proposal would enable the sustainable growth and retention of a business in a rural area, whilst also utilising previously developed land.
76. Employment opportunities would be retained and created through the proposed development, supporting economic growth and investment, both in this business and other associated businesses to which moderate weight can be attached.
77. Most importantly perhaps the retention of the existing wedding venue business and its continued viability would ensure that the viable use of the grade II\* listed building is maintained. It is considered that significant weight should be attached to this benefit.
78. It is considered that the benefits of the proposal as set out above would amount to a substantial cumulative weight such that, in this instance, it is considered to amount to the very special circumstances required to overcome and outweigh the definitional harm to the Green Belt, and harm to openness, which must be accorded substantial weight in line with the Framework.

#### Other matters

79. The potential impediment of rights to free and uninterrupted enjoyment of Lever Park as set out in bye-laws and Acts are not a material planning matter but a civil matter which are not appropriate to consider in determining the proposal.
80. Any applications for further overnight accommodation being sought in the future in the area would be dealt with on their merits, and therefore it is not considered that this proposal would set a precedent.

#### **CONCLUSION**

81. Whilst the proposal would be inappropriate development by definition in the Green Belt, there are very special circumstances that clearly outweigh the definitional harm caused to the Green Belt as a result of inappropriateness. The proposal would meet the statutory test 'to preserve' the significance of the designated heritage assets. It would not have any

detrimental impacts on highway safety, character of the area, neighbour amenity or nature conservation interests. It is, therefore, recommended that the application is approved.

## RELEVANT HISTORY OF THE SITE

**Ref:** 99/00758/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 1 December 1999  
**Description:** Removal of existing outbuildings & construction of new catering facility,

**Ref:** 99/00759/LBC **Decision:** PERLBC **Decision Date:** 1 December 1999  
**Description:** Application for listed building consent to remove existing outbuildings and construct new catering facility,

**Ref:** 08/00091/LBC **Decision:** PERLBC **Decision Date:** 10 April 2008  
**Description:** Listed Building Consent to remove existing timbers on the entrance porch and replace with graded oak frame,

**Ref:** 13/01086/FUL **Decision:** WDN **Decision Date:** 3 June 2014  
**Description:** Creation of external seating terrace with timber framed pergola including retractable canopy, associated landscaping works and lighting

**Ref:** 14/00835/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 17 September 2014  
**Description:** Creation of external seating terrace with three tensile fabric canopies, associated landscaping works and lighting

**Ref:** 15/00012/DIS **Decision:** PEDISZ **Decision Date:** 1 April 2015  
**Description:** Application to discharge condition 4 (samples of materials - York stone for paving) to permission granted under 14/00835/FUL which was for the creation of an external seating terrace with 3 tensile fabric canopies, associated landscaping works & lighting.

**Ref:** 15/00651/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 24 August 2015  
**Description:** Construction of conservatory

**Ref:** 15/00679/LBC **Decision:** PERLBC **Decision Date:** 25 August 2015  
**Description:** Listed building consent for construction of conservatory

**Ref:** 16/00043/MNMA **Decision:** PEMNMZ **Decision Date:** 12 February 2016  
**Description:** Non-material amendment to permission granted under reference 15/00651/FUL for the erection of a conservatory

**Ref:** 16/00044/LBC **Decision:** PERLBC **Decision Date:** 14 March 2016  
**Description:** Amendment to approved conservatory

**Ref:** 17/00649/LBC **Decision:** PERLBC **Decision Date:** 21 August 2017  
**Description:** Listed Building Consent for: The replacement of existing concrete tiles on the roof of the Kitchen Building with Welsh Slate and associated works including underlay, flashing, mortaring and associated works.

**Ref:** 17/00891/DIS **Decision:** PEDISZ **Decision Date:** 29 September 2017  
**Description:** Discharge of Condition (Material Samples) re 17/00649/LBC:- Listed Building Consent for: The replacement of existing concrete tiles on the roof of the Kitchen Building with Welsh Slate and associated works including underlay, flashing, mortaring and associated works.

**Ref:** 21/01342/LBC **Decision:** APPRET **Decision Date:**  
**Description:** Listed building consent for the siting of four shepherds huts to provide overnight wedding accommodation

**Ref:** 94/00513/LBC **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 30 August 1994  
**Description:** Works of maintenance and repair including replacement of roof coverings and rainwater goods and treatment/replacement of timbers

**Ref:** 93/00314/LBC **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 6 July 1993  
**Description:** Listed Building Application for alterations to existing kitchen and store to provide new staff facilities and formation of additional fire escape

**Ref:** 93/00313/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 6 July 1993  
**Description:** Alterations to existing kitchen and store to provide new staff facilities and formation of additional fire escape

**Ref:** 89/01029/FUL **Decision:** PERLBC **Decision Date:** 3 September 1990  
**Description:** Erection of living accommodation for existing tenants following installation of new kitchen complex

**Ref:** 89/01027/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 13 March 1990  
**Description:** Erection of living accommodation for existing tenants following installation of new kitchen complex

**Ref:** 88/00846/COU **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 20 February 1990  
**Description:** Change of use of existing kitchen and store to dining room

**Ref:** 87/00633/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 1 December 1987  
**Description:** Repositioning of bar and new minstrels gallery

**Ref:** 87/00388/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 14 July 1987  
**Description:** Removal of existing bar provision of new bar minstrels gallery and vestibule

**Ref:** 85/00486/LCC **Decision:** PERMIT **Decision Date:** 6 August 1985  
**Description:** Reconstruction of existing car park and construction of new car park at

**Ref:** 75/00195/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 12 May 1975  
**Description:** Replacement store

**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

1. The proposed development must be begun not later than three years from the date of this permission.

*Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.*

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans below:

Title	Plan Ref	Received On
Site Location and Block Plans	P-01 Rev.B	21 March 2022
Proposed Plan and Elevations	P-10	12 November 2021

*Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.*

3. The external facing materials, detailed on the approved plans, shall be used and no others substituted unless alternatives are first submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, when the development shall then be carried out in accordance with the alternatives approved.

*Reason: To ensure that the materials used are visually appropriate to the locality.*

4. The premises shall be used only for overnight wedding accommodation and for no other purpose whatsoever, (including any other purpose in Class C1 of the schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 as amended or any subsequent re-enactment).

*Reason: To ensure that the use is restricted to that applied for.*

5. Any external lighting to be installed shall be installed and operated in complete accordance with the mitigation recommendations set out in section 6.3.2 of the submitted Ecological Appraisal (Greenscape Environmental Reference PEA 22-01 004.1 - 15th February 2022).

*Reason: To ensure protected species are not detrimentally affected by the proposals.*

6. Enhancements for bats and birds through the provision of bat and birds boxes shall be carried out in complete accordance with the enhancement recommendations set out in sections 6.3.3 and 6.5.2 of the submitted Ecological Appraisal (Greenscape Environmental Reference PEA 22-01 004.1 - 15th February 2022).

*Reason: To ensure biodiversity enhancements are provided.*

7. Where any works would need to be undertaken within the rooting areas of trees those works shall be carried out in complete accordance with the recommendations set out in British Standard 5837.

*Reason: To safeguard the health and appearance of any retained trees.*

8. A scheme for the landscaping of the development and its surroundings shall be submitted prior to the commencement of development including the siting of the approved shepherds huts. These details shall include the types and numbers of trees and shrubs to be planted, their distribution on site, those areas to be seeded and any minor artefacts and structures. Landscaping proposals should comprise only native plant communities appropriate to the natural area.

All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details within the first available planting and seeding seasons following the grant of planning permission, and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.

*Reason: To ensure that a satisfactory landscaping scheme for the development is carried out to mitigate the impact of the development and secure a high quality design.*

9. No private amenity spaces or other outdoor facilities shall be provided or installed to serve the shepherds huts hereby approved, and any services (such as electricity, drainage, water supply etc) shall be installed below ground.

*Reason: To ensure that there is no adverse impact on nearby designated heritage assets.*

10. No more than 4 no. shepherds huts trailers shall be stationed on the site at any time.

*Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.*