



AGENDA ITEM:

**PLANNING COMMITTEE:
24th MAY 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. 2 – LEISURE LAKES, THE GRAVEL, MERE BROW

Environment Agency (16.05.18) – no further comments.

Lead Local Flood Authority (22.05.18) – withdraws its objection.

REPORT NO. 4 – SHAW HALL CARAVAN PARK, SMITHY LANE

Paragraph 10.2 of the report should be amended to read:

The site lies within the Green Belt as designated in the Local Plan. It also lies within a Minerals Safeguarding Area as identified in LCC's Minerals and Waste Site Allocation and Development Management Policies DPD. The site is in an area of Landscape History of Local Importance.

OBSERVATIONS OF DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT AND REGENERATION

The site is located within a Minerals Safeguarding Area and within these areas planning permission will not normally be granted for any form of development that is incompatible by reason of scale, proximity and permanence with working the minerals found on the land. However, given the size of the site and its proximity

to existing residential development, which would prevent the working of mineral resources on a commercially viable scale, I consider that the proposals will not result in any greater prejudice to future mineral extraction from the site.

In terms of landscape history, the site is a well-established caravan park and the proposed development would be seen against the backdrop of the caravan park. Therefore, I do not consider that the proposed development would have an undue impact on the landscape character of the area in accordance with Policy EN2 of the Local Plan.

REPORT NO. 5 – LAND TO THE NORTH WEST OF MERE FARM, RUFFORD

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

I have received a further objection from a neighbouring resident, who raises the following concerns:

There has been no meaningful consultation from either the Planning Department or applicant with the immediate neighbours and residents of Holmeswood Road in order to reach agreement on a mutually acceptable location for the proposed building, other than notification by the Planning department of a revised location plan submission;

Whilst the revised submission of 4th May 2018 goes some way towards the addressing the issues raised regarding the location site plan, there are more favourable locations which should be considered, and which would potentially present a workable solution for all parties concerned;

One location which would fundamentally alter the application, but which may not have been considered is to locate the building at the far Northern end of the site. There is vehicular access to the Northern end of the site available via the A565, and there are already a considerable number of buildings of this type and business nature in this locality. Have the applicant and the planning officers considered locating the building at this end of the site?;

The local residents suggest the building is relocated to the far northern side of the site, which is intended to offer a compromise which should be acceptable to the applicant, whilst going some way towards addressing the concerns of the immediate neighbours and local community;

The applicant's original scheme provided for a total site area, comprising the building and hardstanding, of some 3113m sq. This has subsequently been reduced, but only in response to the comments made by local residents regarding the intended use of the site. Based on the Building Regulations requirement to locate the proposed building at least 8 metres from the existing tree line to the Western aspect, siting the building in the location the residents have suggested, would require a total site area of approximately 1600m sq. thereby significantly reducing the area of croppable land lost to the development (by at least 45%);

The residents' proposed location plan presents an 18 metre frontal aspect to Marshes Lane, this is a 50% reduction from that on the applicant's proposal, which has a 37 metre visual aspect and has limited opportunities for mitigation by landscaping;

Based on the residents proposal; a landscaping scheme for the Southern and Eastern aspects of the building and hardstanding would further mitigate the impact on the aspect to Marshes Lane, helping to assimilate the building into the surrounding amenity;

The resident's location would facilitate the construction of surface water drainage soakaways which would have a secondary benefit of providing irrigation for the proposed landscaping scheme;

In its current proposed location, the potential for noise nuisance to livestock stored within the adjoining barns, including mares in foal, is considerable. The residents' proposal further reduces the potential for disturbance;

The resident's suggested revised location offers no detriment to the vehicular access to the building or hardstanding by either delivery vehicles or agricultural machinery used on the site;

To address residents' fears over possible future development of the site, and to ensure that the visual amenity of the area is maintained, I would respectfully ask that additional conditions attached to the application are considered, and based on the following;

There should be no additional hardstanding created on the site, over and above that which is included within this application, without the express consent of the Local Planning Authority

No plant, machinery, articulated trailer units (except agricultural trailers), chemicals, pallets or equipment shall be stored outside the building, on the hardstanding or at any other location on the site.

I have also received comments from the CPRE (21.05.18) who would like the Council to consider a condition to prohibit the storage building being converted into a dwelling at a future time. CPRE Lancashire is very concerned that the Government has relaxed planning controls in rural areas so much that barns can be converted into dwellings under permitted development without due consideration to the impact on the amenity of neighbours and local rural character and promoting unsustainable settlement growth at farmsteads.

OBSERVATIONS OF DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT AND REGENERATION

The proposed building has been repositioned further from the nearest residential properties since the original proposal. Alternative locations have been considered and the applicant has advised that to position the building close to the north-western boundary as suggested by residents, would be too restrictive in terms of the cropping system of the land and the extent of the land that it would take up. Along the western boundary is a drainage ditch and a tapered tree line. The applicant advises that the building would have to be set in about 8m from this boundary, pushing the building further eastwards, thereby resulting in the loss of a significant amount of croplable land.

The applicant has amended the original location, although not positioned where local residents would wish it to be. I am required to determine the application as submitted and in my view, the position of the building is acceptable. It remains closely grouped with other buildings in order to reduce the visual impact on the character of the Green Belt, yet is sufficiently distant from neighbouring residential properties such that no significant loss of outlook, noise nuisance or privacy will occur. The Council's Environmental Health Officer has advised that the submitted option is preferable from a noise perspective as a building closer to the north-west boundary, as suggested, is closer to and faces houses along Holmeswood Road (Runner Cottages). Furthermore, the area of proposed hardstanding has been relocated further away from neighbouring residents and is shielded to some degree from the building itself, thereby reducing any potential noise and disturbance.

Both representations above include requests for additional conditions to be imposed on any planning permission, should it be granted. I consider that the conditions as recommended are those necessary to make the development acceptable and meet the tests for planning conditions.

REPORT NO. 6 – AUGHTON INSTITUTE, BOLD LANE, AUGHTON

OTHER REPRESENTATIONS

In response to the amended plans I have received two letters of objection from neighbouring properties. Their concerns are summarised below:

Whilst the dwelling has been scaled down, half a metre off the height seems to be a token gesture and it will make no difference to the privacy instruction on neighbours;

The proposed house is enormous and will dwarf my property;

All upper windows facing north on the plan will look directly into my bungalow resulting in a loss of privacy;

The landscaping plan shows a tree to be planted which when mature will over sail my garden and block all the sunlight from afternoon onwards;

Concern about the added height and massing adjacent to neighbours boundary for an extra floor of accommodation above garage;

Increased height of dwelling from previous consent (8m) and proposal is higher than the two neighbouring properties. No substantiation for increase above consented 8m height;

Within section 10.2 & 10.3 of the officer's report there is repeated use of the words "only a marginal increase", "marginal increase" is subjective. The footprint has increased +18% plus added height and massing to the garage block for increase accommodation at 1st floor on top of the neighbour's boundary. Increased overall height from previous consented scheme;

Section 10.8 – Highways. The quality of the site location plan continues to be accepted by the planning department. I have drawn a draft swept path analysis of emergency vehicles for reference.

A further representation has been received from Aughton Institute Limited which advises that at the time of the original planning application, it was unclear whether the loss of a 5m strip of the Bowling Green which was required to provide an access driveway would impact upon the ability of the bowling club to play games. Therefore a condition was applied to require the extension of the bowling green along its eastern boundary. However, since the previous application, the access has been commenced and the reduction in width of the bowling green has had very limited impact on the playing facilities.

The Institute letter indicates that the piece of green which was lost was poor quality due to it suffering limited light and root ingress due to its position under a tree canopy. The letter indicates that bowlers have reacted positively to the change to the green, with players commenting that they avoided using that section of the green because of the above points. The bowling green is fully functioning and remains one of the largest in the district. The club would prefer not to have to widen the bowling green as extending the green would result in the loss of the area currently used by spectators. Furthermore the cost of extending

the green would be substantial and the initial land sale was made to try and ensure that the Institute remains financially viable.

OBSERVATIONS OF DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT AND REGENERATION

The agenda report indicates that the design and scale of the dwelling is considered to be acceptable in principle. The previously approved dwelling on the plot had windows at first floor level in the north elevation and the current proposal meets the separation distance in the Council's Design Guide. The proposed roof lights to the north elevation would be sited at high level in the roof slope and their position would prevent overlooking.

The height of the main dwelling has been increased by a 0.6m and the height of the triple garage has increased by 1.5m to accommodate living space within the roof. Whilst concern has been raised about the increased size and mass of the dwelling, the minimum spacing distances prescribed in the Council's Design Guide are maintained with all neighbouring properties which surround the site. More than 21m would remain between the front elevation of the proposed property and the rear elevation of number 18 Ledson Grove. Whilst the height of the garage would increase adjacent to the boundary with number 18, I consider sufficient distance exists between the two properties not to result in an adverse loss of light.

The submitted landscaping scheme shows the trees to be planted within the rear garden are suitable for a domestic setting. The Council's Landscape Officer has considered the proposals and considers them to be acceptable.

As per the previously approved application, access to the site is proposed through the car park of Aughton Institute. The Highway Authority has considered the proposals and considers them to be acceptable.

Conditions

Given the information submitted by the Aughton Institute and that the development would not have a negative impact on community facilities it is proposed to remove condition number 12 which reads:

No development shall take place until full details of the extension to the bowling green, including any landscaping details, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The extension to the bowling green shall be constructed in accordance with a timetable to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority.