



Kim Webber B.Sc. M.Sc.
Chief Executive
52 Derby Street
Ormskirk
West Lancashire
L39 2DF

Thursday 18 January 2018

TO: COUNCILLORS

**G DOWLING, M MILLS, I ASHCROFT, MRS P BAYBUTT,
T DEVINE, D EVANS, G HODSON, C MARSHALL, D MCKAY,
D O'TOOLE, R PENDLETON, E POPE, A PRITCHARD,
MRS M WESTLEY AND A YATES**

Dear Councillor,

LATE INFORMATION

Please find attached a report containing details of Late Information prepared by the Director of Development and Regeneration, relating to items appearing on the agenda for the above meeting.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Kim Webber", written over a horizontal line.

Kim Webber
Chief Executive

AGENDA (Open to the Public)

7. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

To consider the report of the Director of Development and Regeneration.

989 -
990

We can provide this document, upon request, on audiotape, in large print, in Braille and in other languages.

FIRE EVACUATION PROCEDURE: Please see attached sheet.

MOBILE PHONES: These should be switched off or to 'silent' at all meetings.

For further information, please contact:-

Jill Ryan on 01695 585017

Or email jill.ryan@westlancs.gov.uk



**PLANNING COMMITTEE:
18th JANUARY 2018**

Report of: Director of Development and Regeneration

Contact: Mrs. C. Thomas (Extn.5134)
Email: catherine.thomas@westlancs.gov.uk

SUBJECT: LATE INFORMATION

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The information below has been received since compilation of your Agenda. The following also includes suggested adjustments to the recommendations further to the receipt of late plans and/or information.

2.0 ITEM 7 – PLANNING APPLICATIONS

REPORT NO. 1 – 75-77 LIVERPOOL ROAD SOUTH, BURSCOUGH

A further neighbour representation has been received, commenting:

Burscough Town is a terrible bottle neck currently, never mind when construction traffic, delivery vehicles and staff/visitors vehicles will be added to the mix; Would hope yellow lines will be applied to A59 for a considerable distance either side of the entrance.

OBSERVATIONS OF DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT AND REGENERATION

An additional planning condition is recommended:

Condition 29: "A Traffic Management Plan for the construction vehicles and staff accessing the site during the construction works, should be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any works begin on site and should thereafter be adhered to at all times during construction works".

Reason: "To safeguard the safety and interests of the users of the highway and to ensure that the development complies with the provisions of Policy GN3 in the adopted West Lancashire Local Plan 2012-2027 Development Plan Document".

REPORT NO. 2 – LAND TO THE REAR OF 187-191 WIGAN ROAD, LATHOM

Additional neighbour representations have been received and can be summarised as follows:

There is an error in paragraph 10.12 of the report relating to the distance from neighbouring properties;

The development does not comply with guidance for distance between buildings for keeping of pigs and residential properties.

OBSERVATIONS OF DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT AND REGENERATION

Paragraph 10.12 is amended to read as follows:

In my view the proposed development would not increase the level of activity on the site, rather it enables the animals, machinery and feeds to be housed in one building rather than in various places across the site. It is my view that the impact on neighbouring properties would be minimal as the building is more than 100m from the nearest dwellings on Wigan Road and the rear of the building would be located approx. 35m from the rear of the dwelling at no.17 Dickets Lane. I consider that a condition to control the use of the building would be appropriate to limit the impact on neighbour amenity from future change of use.

In response to the concerns raised in the additional neighbour representation regarding the separation distance between residential properties and buildings used for mixed purposes including the keeping of pigs, the current guidance document by DEFRA (Protecting Our Water, Soil and Air: A Code of Good Agricultural Practice for Farmers, Growers and Land Managers) does not appear to specify a minimum separation distance. The activity on the site is low-level and somewhat restricted by the size of the associated land. I consider that the proposed development would not have a detrimental impact on the amenities of nearby residents sufficient to warrant a refusal of planning permission.