



**PLANNING COMMITTEE:
19th APRIL 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 – CHARLTON, QUARRY DRIVE

On 11th April 2018, Aughton Parish Council commented on the application as follows:

The application was considered at the April monthly Parish Council meeting and members referred to the history of the site and the previous proposal 2016/1183/FUL. After consideration of all the reports submitted, members reiterated previous comments and raised no objections to the latest application providing the demolition of this property is essential for 'health and safety' reasons and the proposed replacement dwelling would preserve or enhance the character of Granville Park Conservation Area.

REPORT NO. 3 – LAND TO THE NORTH-WEST OF MERE FARM

The applicant has submitted a swept path analysis showing how articulated vehicles can turn around within the site.

The Council has received 5 additional letters raising the following concerns:

Amendments do not allay concerns of residents;

Site would benefit from smaller building further away from residential properties;
Proposed activities would have detrimental effect on residents;
Detrimental to highway safety; if Lancashire County Council have used the data provided by the applicant, i.e. 3 to 4 tractor movements and one articulated vehicle per day, it is questionable if due diligence has been provided. The vehicle movements should be at least 10 more;
None of the proposed conditions deal with the dominating proximity of the building to the adjacent dwellings;
Landscaping will not mitigate proximity of building to residential properties;
Limiting the hours of operation to all vehicles except agricultural vehicles is irrelevant as agricultural vehicles are large and noisy and could access the site 24/7;
Proposal should include noise impact assessment;
Absence of noise impact assessment would be grounds for those affected to pursue council;
Conditions 1, 2 3, restrict access to the site but make reference to the building. As such it is clear the applicant's intention is to operate on the site at any time;
Proposal may result in statutory nuisance;
Over development in green belt;
Visual impact;
Proximity to neighbours;
The trench bordering the site does not drain away and may flood;
Further road development will be necessary to accommodate a development of this size.

OBSERVATIONS OF DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT AND REGENERATION

The proposal is for an agricultural building on agricultural land which is acceptable in principle. At the present time are no restrictions on the site and the applicant can carry out as many vehicular movements into and out of the site as necessary for the purposes of agriculture. The track has planning permission and has been designed to allow large scale equipment and machinery to effectively access the land. The layout of the yard would enable vehicles to turn within the site and exit in a forward gear. The highway authority are satisfied that the development the subject of this application will not have a detrimental impact on highway safety.

In terms of the siting of the building, it would be positioned within a cluster of built development to the rear of an existing agricultural building. The presence of the existing agricultural building would help screen the nearby residential properties from any potential noise from operations on the yard area. The proposed development would be sited more than 10 metres from the site boundary on the far side of the existing track, approximately 40 metres from the rear facing windows in Mere Farm and over 30 metres from any of the facing windows in the proposed new dwelling on the Mere Farm site. This is well in excess of the separation distances recommended in the Council's Design Guide and will prevent the development being overbearing in relation to neighbouring properties or resulting in poor outlook sufficient to warrant a refusal of planning permission.

With the imposition of suitable conditions I remain satisfied that the proposed development is acceptable in principle.