



AGENDA ITEM:

**PLANNING COMMITTEE:
9TH MARCH 2017**

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 – CHARLTON, QUARRY DRIVE

Since compilation of the agenda report I have received a further letter from the applicant attaching an additional submission from Carr Faulkner Associates, (Structural Engineers).

The agenda report refers to an earlier letter from Carr Faulkner dated 10th June 2016 which identified various options to address the property's existing structural issues. These included strengthening the existing foundations through underpinning as well as demolition of the dwelling.

In the most recent letter from Carr Faulkner dated 27th February 2017 there appears to have been a shift in opinion as the letter indicates that in their view the only practical solution to ensure the long term stability of the property is to demolish and rebuild off a piled foundation. The letter indicates that the presence of peat below the site which is weak and unstable means that further movement of the property cannot be ruled out and whilst strengthening of the foundations is possible, practically it would prove difficult. Therefore they conclude that the only practical solution would be to demolish the property.

Given this position the applicant has suggested that officers review their position in relation to this application.

OBSERVATIONS OF DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT AND REGENERATION

Having read the letter from Carr Faulkner Associates and the earlier submission dated the 10th June 2016, it is not clear why a fully piled solution (Option 2 in the earlier report) cannot be undertaken. The 10th June report explains the issues relating to underpinning (expensive, disruptive etc.) but concludes that this would fully stabilise the property. The 27th February letter suggests that the only practical solution would be to demolish and rebuild the dwelling. I am unclear what has changed between the 10th June 2016 and the 27th February 2017 for Carr Faulkner Associates to adjust their stance. It does not appear that any further assessment has been carried out of the property which would account for this difference in opinion.

Regardless it is clear from the letters that from an 'engineering' viewpoint demolition would be the best option. However no financial information has been put forward to suggest that underpinning the whole property would not be viable. I have asked the Reid Jones Partnership (Civil and Structural Engineers) to review the stance taken by Carr Faulkner, but without access to the property it is difficult for a third party to fully assess the situation. Reid Jones have advised that solutions available would include underpinning the whole property. Based on the information available they advise that this would be likely to result in some of the walls being rebuilt with subsequent internal refurbishment. Reid Jones conclude that it is probably most cost effective to demolish and rebuild the property.

However this assessment is made on the basis of limited information. I am not aware that the property has been re-assessed since June and the option of underpinning appears to remain. Given the important contribution Charlton makes to the character and appearance of the Granville Park Conservation Area in my opinion demolition should be the last resort.

As stated in paragraph 7.12 of the main report no assessment of the costs of the proposed underpinning or viability in relation to the works suggested within the survey report has been submitted with the application for demolition and therefore I cannot factor this into my assessment. I would therefore conclude that the recent letter supplied by Carr Faulkner Associates does not provide sufficient justification for the demolition of Charlton.

The Inspector in the previous planning appeal relating to the demolition of Charlton found that despite the structural issues, so long as it is reasonably practical to retain the existing house, the proposal to demolish and rebuild would not preserve the character of the Conservation Area. I am not satisfied that at the current time it has been established that it is no longer reasonably practical to retain the existing house.

As stated in the agenda report, in my view loss of Charlton would be harmful to the character and appearance of the Granville Park Conservation Area and therefore would conflict with the Council's statutory duty under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and with the NPPF and Policy EN4 of the Local Plan.

REPORT NO. 2 – 7 BEECH ROAD, AUGHTON

The plans submitted as part of the application had an incorrect scale. Whilst measurements shown on the plans were accurate, revised drawings have now been submitted to clarify the position.

Therefore condition 3 is amended as follows:

The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with details shown on the following plans:-

Plans reference

A1184.01B

A1184.02D

A1184.04A

A1184.03C

received by the Local Planning Authority on 03/03/17.

REPORT NO. 3 – SHIRE OAKS, WIGAN ROAD

The Council has received comments from South Lathom Resident's Association. These can be summarised as follows:

In setting out the issues of very special circumstances, the officer's report addresses neither the practical aspects of this application nor the merits of the proposal to keep five horses (or other animals) in the long term on only two acres of land. The Resident's Association has provided a leaflet issued by the British Horse Society which indicates that a two acre site will only support the grazing and exercise of two horses, maximum.

It is unclear how the horses will be cared for in accordance with the British Horse Society guidelines given that the applicant lives in Southport and there is no permission for anyone to reside on the site.

Horses need exercise and a fresh water supply. Slate Brook should not be used as a fresh water supply and should be fenced off; there is insufficient land available for exercising the horses. They will need to be exercised off-site which raises the question of them being taken out through the entrance straight onto a busy section of a main road at a dangerous junction.

Planning permission should not be granted which would lead to animals not being cared for properly or where it would not be consistent with the proposed private, non-commercial restriction and/or highway's comments about movements into, and out of, the site.

The officer's report (para. 7.31) refers to the need for Land Drainage Consent to be obtained from Lancashire County Council's Lead Local Flood Authority but no condition has been proposed to prevent the construction of the ditch until such consent has been obtained. The ditch would increase the natural flow of water into Dicket's Brook and the water could be contaminated. Therefore we do not

believe that such consent will be obtained. Dicket's Brook flows under different names into areas of high flood risk and that maintenance of the downstream pumped drainage system is under threat of being abandoned by the Environment Agency.

OBSERVATIONS OF DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT AND REGENERATION

With respect to the future care of the horses (or other animals) on the site, it is the occupier's responsibility to ensure that such meets any relevant standards as set by other regulatory/advisory bodies. This is not a material planning consideration.

As set out in the officer's report, the Council is satisfied that the applicant has explored the disposal of surface water in accordance with the hierarchy as set out in the National Planning Practice Guidance. It is the applicant's responsibility to obtain Land Drainage Consent from LCC in respect of the proposed disposal of water into Dicket's Brook and it is LCC who would have the appropriate powers to take action should any unauthorised works be carried out. To obtain land drainage consent from LCC, the applicant will need to demonstrate that the drainage proposal will not have an adverse impact on the watercourse. As the drainage impacts will be considered by LCC through the Land Drainage Consenting process I do not consider it necessary to impose a planning condition in relation to the submission of a drainage scheme.

REPORT NO. 4 – WATER TOWER, TOWER HILL

REPRESENTATIONS FROM NEIGHBOURS

Additional letters of representation have been received and can be summarised as follows:

Reiterate concerns previously raised relating to overlooking and loss of privacy;
Reiterate that the proposed amended design is not in keeping with the area or the listed building;
Concern that the height of the new part of the building is shown to be increased in the latest amendment;
Concerns regarding the processing of the application and the consultations sent out;
Concern that officers have not visited the top of the Tower and that site visits to neighbouring properties have not been undertaken.

OBSERVATIONS OF DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT AND REGENERATION

The concerns regarding overlooking and loss of privacy are acknowledged. Having reviewed all the submitted documentation I am satisfied that due to the design of the proposed dwelling, the separation distances to nearby properties and height of the tower, the development would not result in significant adverse impact on residential amenity of nearby occupants.

I can confirm that the height of the proposed new structure has not been increased in the most recent submission.

I am satisfied that the application has been dealt with in accordance with the Council's usual procedures and written submissions from local residents have been given due consideration in the assessment of the application.

REPORT NO. 10 – POOL HEY CARAVAN SITE

The recommendation for approval in this case relies, in part, on the very special circumstances put forward by the applicants. One such circumstance is that the extended family have occupied this site for many years. As such, I am minded to impose a condition that ensures the site is only used in perpetuity by the extended family. I therefore recommend the following additional condition:

Condition 10

The site shall be occupied by relatives of the applicants only.

Reason

In granting this permission the Local Planning Authority has had regard to the special circumstances of the case and wishes to have the opportunity of exercising control over any subsequent occupation in the event of the applicant vacating the premises, thereby ensuring any future occupation would not conflict with the provisions of Policy GN1 in the adopted West Lancashire Local Plan 2012-2027 Development Plan Document.