



REPORT FROM: PLANNING, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND
REGULATORY SERVICES MANAGER

TO: BRIERFIELD AND REEDLEY COMMITTEE

DATE: 04th November 2020

Report Author: Neil Watson
Tel. No: 01282 661706
E-mail: neil.watson@pendle.gov.uk

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To determine the attached planning applications.

REPORT TO BRIERFIELD & REEDLEY COMMITTEE 4th NOVEMBER, 2020

Application Ref: 20/0450/HHO

Proposal: Full: Erection of two storey side extension and part two storey part single storey rear extension and formation of parking area to front.

At: 3 Clegg Street Brierfield

On behalf of: Mr Asham

Date Registered: 17 July 2020

Expiry Date: 11 September 2020

Case Officer: Kathryn Hughes

Site Description and Proposal

The application site is a semi-detached residential property within a residential area in the settlement boundary of Brierfield.

This application seeks to erect a two storey side extension and part two storey part single storey rear extension to form two further reception room, a kitchen and W.C. at ground floor and two bedrooms and a study/library at first floor.

The proposed two storey side extension would project out to the side by 2.5m and has an overall depth of 8.9m, 3.85m beyond the existing house at a height of 5m to eaves and 7m to ridge. The single storey element would be located adjacent to the side boundary with no. 1 and project out 3.85m with a height to eaves of 2.5m and overall height of 3.5m.

There are existing fence and hedges along the boundary

The extensions would be finished in brick and an off-white render to match the existing house. Roof slates to match the existing are proposed.

Relevant Planning History

None.

Consultee Response

LCC Highways – No objection but recommend that the parking areas are of a bound porous material and created prior to first occupation.

Brierfield Town Council

Public Response

Nearest neighbours notified by letter without response.

Officer Comments

The main considerations for this application are impact on residential amenity, impact on amenity, design and materials and highway issues.

1. Policy

The relevant policies are:

ENV2 sets out general design principles and climate change.

The Design Principles Supplementary Planning Document SPD offers advice on domestic extensions.

2. Impact on Residential Amenity

Policy ENV 2 requires all new development to meet high standards of design, being innovative to obtain the best design solution and use materials appropriate to the setting.

The Design SPD states in the General Principles that extensions should leave adequate room around the dwelling to avoid a cramped appearance, take account of regular spacing to avoid a terracing effect and leave adequate garden area.

In terms of impact on neighbours it states that extensions must adequately protect neighbours enjoying their own homes and extensions must not overshadow to an unacceptable degree or have an overbearing effect on neighbouring properties. Windows in extensions should not directly and inappropriately overlook adjacent properties. Extensions should have regard to the minimum spacing standards and maintain a distance of 21m between habitable room windows in properties that directly facing each other.

The adjacent semi no. 5 Clegg Street would not be unduly affected by this proposal as although the rear extension would project 4m further rearwards than the existing rear elevation this is separated by a distance of 4m from the proposed two storey side extension. The proposed single storey element to the rear would project out 4m along the side boundary with no. 1 Clegg Street which would also be acceptable. However, the properties to the rear are bungalows and these, as well as the application site, have very shallow rear gardens of 9.6m at its longest point reduced to 6m at its shortest.

At present the distance between the application site and no. 15 is 14m rear elevation to rear elevation whilst the distance to no. 13 is only 12m at the nearest point excluding the existing conservatory on the rear of the application site which projects out 3m. This is already a constrained site therefore and the two storey element would reduce the distance to 8m rear to rear from No. 13 which is clearly well below the 21m. Moreover, the stands require significant changes in levels to be taken into account for example the relationship between a two storey and three storey building/extension the separation distance should be increased by 3m. i.e. 24m and not 21m.

Although the bungalows are set at an oblique angle this proposal would clearly impact on amenity and would lead to overlooking from the two proposed bedroom windows and also an overbearing impact when viewed from the rear windows of this property especially as no. 13 has its main bedroom window in this rear elevation and this proposal would severely impact on that outlook to an unacceptable degree.

The proposed two storey rear extension therefore would result in an adverse impact on the neighbouring property at no. 13 Clegg Street due to the lack of appropriate separation distance and height of the proposal in relation to the rear boundary.

The agent has suggested that a higher boundary treatment and obscure glazing could resolve some of these issues. A boundary treatment above 2m could in itself lead to unacceptable impacts and would only screen the ground floor element, whilst obscure glazing for first floor

bedroom windows is not an acceptable design solution and would not address the overbearing impact of the two storey element.

In terms of setting the two storey element back this would not provide sufficient separation distances in my view and therefore would not provide an acceptable solution. I fail to see how any two storey projection here would not impact on the bungalow to the rear in terms of privacy and overbearing impact.

Reference has also be made to a two storey extension recently approved at No. 35 Clegg Street. However, this application is different in that is a corner property and the two storey element faces onto a blank gable and not a rear elevation with windows to habitable rooms. In any event each application is considered on its own merits.

The proposal therefore fails to accord with policy ENV2 and the Design SPD in this respect.

3. Design and Materials

Whilst the two storey extension would be fairly prominent in the street scene it is set back from the street by 5.4m and therefore would not create an incongruous feature in the street scene and in this respect it complies with the Design SPD in relation to two storey side extensions.

The use of brick and render and roof tiles would be acceptable in this location.

The extension is acceptable in terms of design and materials and therefore accords with policy ENV2 and the Design Principles Supplementary Planning Document in this regard.

4. Highways

The property currently has two bedrooms and the extension would result in an additional two bedrooms. At present the site does not have any off-street parking and the proposal seeks to create off-street parking for one vehicle which is acceptable.

This would be acceptable and accords with Policy 31.

5. Summary

The proposed two storey rear extension element would adversely impact on the amenity of the bungalows to the rear at no.13 Clegg Street.

The scheme therefore fails to accords with policies ENV2 of the Core Strategy and the Design Principles Supplementary Planning Document.

Recommendation: Refuse

For the following reason:

1. The two storey rear extension element of this proposal would reduce the distances between the application site and the bungalows sited to the rear (no.13 Clegg Street) to an unacceptable degree that would adversely impact on the amenity of this property and result in overlooking and an overbearing impact when viewed from the rear windows.

The scheme therefore fails to accords with policies ENV2 of the Core Strategy and the Design Principles Supplementary Planning Document.

Application Ref: 20/0450/HHO

Proposal: Full: Erection of two storey side extension and part two storey part single storey rear extension and formation of parking area to front.

At: 3 Clegg Street Brierfield

On behalf of: Mr Asham

BRIERFIELD AND REEDLEY AREA COMMITTEE 4TH NOVEMBER 2020

Application Ref: 20/0474/FUL

Proposal: Full: Erection of a single storey extension and works to form an extended playground.

At: Holy Trinity Roman Catholic Primary School, Halifax Road, Brierfield.

On behalf of: Mary Lyle

Date Registered: 05.08.2020

Expiry Date: 06.11.2020

Case Officer: Charlotte Pinch

Site Description and Proposal

This application is to be decided at committee as it has received more than three objections.

The application site is an existing primary school, located within the settlement boundary of Brierfield.

The proposed is to erect a single storey, flat roof extension, on the eastern elevation of the main school building, and extend the existing playground area. The extension would provide a new nursery facility, for 13 students. The extension would have a total height of 3.1m, width of 10.3m and depth of 10.3m. It would be constructed of brickwork to match the existing building, bitumen flat felt roof and dark brown aluminium windows.

Relevant Planning History

13/06/0026P

Full: Erect single storey extension to southern elevation.

Approved with Conditions. 2006.

Consultee Response

LCC Highways

12th August 2020 - I have viewed the plans and Design and access statement and there is insufficient detail to enable full comments to be provided.

As it is not currently term-time, we cannot provide a comprehensive response and I would request that this application is not decided until the school resumes in September once a site visit is undertaken and we can make full assessment of the current traffic impact on the surrounding highway network.

We need to understand the current parking arrangements for the primary school staff and parents and how this proposal is likely to be accommodated when there is no proposed increase in off-street parking. Please provide any additional information in this respect. If the school has a Travel Plan or has undertaken any surveys of modal travel in the past, these can be submitted to support the application, if they demonstrate a high proportion of sustainable travel for instance walking from the local area. .

Please also provide the additional number of staff and children that the nursery can accommodate and relate this to the parking standard as follows:- For a D1 Nursery, 1.5 spaces per 2 staff plus drop-off zone (in or outside curtilage) of 11 space per 10 children.

28th September 2020 - I visited site during the morning drop off period and pedestrian and vehicle movements.

The on-street parking on Halifax Road in the vicinity of the school and extending in a northerly and southerly direction was high. The parking is generated by residents predominantly and by parents arriving at school to drop off their children.

Due to the high level of on-street parking there were instances of a vehicle parking on the school zig zags, driveways being obstructed and vehicles parking at road junctions. The flow of background traffic on Halifax Road is high and there is a school crossing patrol present. I observed two occasions where vehicles did not comply with the crossing patrol which was a concern. The level of activity and conflict between vehicles and pedestrians is high and it would be a concern to increase this conflict.

The proposed increase in pre-school age children is likely to increase the demand on on-street parking and increase the level of conflict.

Based upon 13 additional children and no additional staff, there would be a requirement of 1 drop off space in accordance with the parking standards. There are no spaces proposed inside the curtilage and the spaces outside the curtilage are in very high demand. Generally the younger the age of the pupils, the closer to the premises the parents want to park their vehicles.

This is a small impact in isolation however the cumulative impact is severe based upon my observations of the existing parking and traffic generation in the vicinity of the school.

13th October 2020 – Following the submission of further information, there is no objection to the proposal subject to the submission of a Travel Plan which includes the staggered start and end times of the pre-school children who do not have siblings in the primary school.

Cadent Gas – Plant Protection

Cadent have identified operational gas apparatus within the application site boundary. This may include a legal interest (easements or wayleaves) in the land which restricts activity in proximity to Cadent assets in private land. The Applicant must ensure that proposed works do not infringe on Cadent's legal rights and any details of such restrictions should be obtained from the landowner in the first instance.

If buildings or structures are proposed directly above the gas apparatus then development should only take place following a diversion of this apparatus. The Applicant should contact Cadent's Plant Protection Team at the earliest opportunity to discuss proposed diversions of apparatus to avoid any unnecessary delays.

If any construction traffic is likely to cross a Cadent pipeline then the Applicant must contact Cadent's Plant Protection Team to see if any protection measures are required.

All developers are required to contact Cadent's Plant Protection Team for approval before carrying out any works on site and ensuring requirements are adhered to.

PBC Environmental Health

No objection.

Coal Authority

I have reviewed the site location plans and the proposals and supporting information submitted and available to view on the LPA website and can confirm that the site falls within the defined Development High Risk Area.

The Coal Authority records indicate that the site where development is taking place is within an area of probable shallow coal mining and a thick coal seam inferred to outcrop within the site that may also have been historically worked by illicit means.

As you will be aware, the Coal Authority's general approach in cases where development is proposed within the Development High Risk Area is to recommend that the applicant obtains coal mining information for the application site and submits a Coal Mining Risk Assessment to support the planning application.

However, when considering the nature of this particular development proposal (small scale extension to an existing school building) and the planning history at this site, we do not consider that requiring a Coal Mining Risk Assessment would be proportionate to the development proposed and in this particular instance, we do not object to this planning application.

Reedley Hallows Parish Council

Fully support the application.

Public Response

Five letters of objection have been received from neighbouring occupiers, their comments can be summarised as follows:

- Under the impression the land is protected and would never be built on.
- Will result in a significant increase in traffic, which the road cannot sustain.
- Existing parking problems at school times, which will be exacerbated.
- Noise and mess as a result of the construction works.
- Reduction in the value of properties in the area.
- Loss of privacy and overlooking to neighbouring gardens.

Officer Comments

Policy

Pendle Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy

Policy ENV 2 (Achieving Quality in Design and Conservation) states that all new development should viably seek to deliver the highest possible standards of design, in form and sustainability, and be designed to meet future demands whilst enhancing and conserving our heritage assets.

Policy ENV 4 (Promoting Sustainable Travel) proposals for new development should have regard to the potential impacts they may cause to the highways network, particularly in terms of safety and congestion.

Policy SUP 3 (Education and Training) aims to deliver key developments that will improve educational and training opportunities. The provision of improved primary education facilities will be supported where a need exists.

Replacement Pendle Local Plan

Policy 31 (Parking) sets out the maximum amount of parking required for a site.

Visual Amenity

Proposals should be developed taking into consideration the context of the area and the buildings within it and new developments should demonstrate a relationship to existing groups of buildings.

The proposed nursery extension would be of single storey height and located centrally to the rear of the main school building, therefore would not be visible from the public highway. The building would be of a simple functional design, which reflects a school environment. It would have a flat roof and would be significantly lower in height than the existing school building. The materials of brickwork to match the existing school, bitumen flat felt roof and dark brown aluminium windows would be appropriate.

The works would also include the extension of the existing playground to the rear. This would require some excavation into the existing hillside and erection of a retaining structure of gabions to provide the additional playground space. These works would be undertaken at a lower land level than the existing hillside and would not increase the height of the existing playground. These works would not be visible from outside the school site.

The proposed development therefore acceptable in terms of visual amenity in accordance with Policy ENV2.

Residential Amenity

The application site is set within generous school grounds on all four elevations. The single storey extension and playground alterations would be set at a lower level than the surrounding properties, as the land rises to the east of the site.

The closest residential property to the development would be 20m to the east on Hillside View, however these properties are set at a higher land level than the school. Therefore, this proposal would not result in acceptable overlooking or overbearing impacts on adjacent properties.

The proposed extension would be within the same use as the existing school buildings and therefore would raise no adverse amenity or noise issues over and above the current situation. It is therefore acceptable in terms of amenity in accordance with Policy ENV2.

Highway Issues

The proposed extension is to comprise of a nursery, to be used in conjunction with the school, for 13 additional children and no additional staff. As a result, this would require one additional drop of space on site in accordance with the parking standards. Although this is a small impact in isolation it can have larger cumulative impacts.

However, further information from the school highlighted that surveys undertaken indicated that the majority of nursery students have siblings already at the school, so this is unlikely to result in a significant number of additional vehicles. A staggered drop off system is in place, details of which are to be submitted as part of a travel plan, which can be secured by condition.

Reason for Decision

Section 38 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that applications be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The proposed development is acceptable in terms of policy, design, amenity and highway safety. The development therefore complies with the development plan. There is a positive presumption in favour of approving the development and there are no material reasons to object to the application.

RECOMMENDATION: Approval

Subject to the following conditions:

1. The proposed development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

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

PL-01, PL-02, PL-03 RevA, PL-04 RevA and PL-05.

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

3. All materials to be used in the external construction of the proposed development shall be as stated on the application form and approved drawings and shall not be varied without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: These materials are appropriate to the locality and in order to allow the Local Planning Authority to control the external appearance of the development.

4. Prior to the first of the development hereby permitted, a Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This must include details of measures to reduce travel by private car and a schedule of staggered school times for students. The approved plan shall be adhered to for as long as the development hereby permitted remains in use.

Reason: In the interests of pedestrian and highway safety and to ensure the adequate provision of access and parking within the site.

INFORMATIVE

The proposed development lies within an area that has been defined by the Coal Authority as containing potential hazards arising from former coal mining activity. These hazards can include: mine entries (shafts and adits); shallow coal workings; geological features (fissures and break lines); mine gas and previous surface mining sites.

Although such hazards are seldom readily visible, they can often be present and problems can occur in the future, particularly as a result of development taking place.

It is recommended that information outlining how the former mining activities affect the proposed development, along with any mitigation measures required (for example the need for gas

protection measures within the foundations), be submitted alongside any subsequent application for Building Regulations approval (if relevant).

Any intrusive activities which disturb or enter any coal seams, coal mine workings or coal mine entries (shafts and adits) requires a Coal Authority Permit. Such activities could include site investigation boreholes, digging of foundations, piling activities, other ground works and any subsequent treatment of coal mine workings and coal mine entries for ground stability purposes. Failure to obtain a Coal Authority Permit for such activities is trespass, with the potential for court action.

Property specific summary information on past, current and future coal mining activity can be obtained from: www.groundstability.com or a similar service provider.

If any of the coal mining features are unexpectedly encountered during development, this should be reported immediately to the Coal Authority on 0345 762 6848. Further information is available on the Coal Authority website at: www.gov.uk/coalauthority

Application Ref: 20/0474/FUL

Proposal: Full: Erection of a single storey extension and works to form an extended playground.

At: Holy Trinity Roman Catholic Primary School, Halifax Road, Brierfield.

On behalf of: Mary Lyle

BRIERFIELD AND REEDLEY AREA COMMITTEE 4TH NOVEMBER 2020

Application Ref: 20/0524/PIP
Proposal: Permission in Principle: Erection of up to 6 No. dwelling houses.
At: Land To The North of Rockwood, Halifax Road, Nelson.
On behalf of: The Mill Company Ltd.
Date Registered: 24.08.2020
Expiry Date: 06.11.2020
Case Officer: Charlotte Pinch

Site Description and Proposal

This application is to be decided at committee as it has received more than three objections. The application site is a piece of undeveloped land linked to Nelson Golf Club, which is designated as Open Space. The site is located within the Open Countryside, directly adjacent to the settlement boundary.

The proposal is for the erection of six dwellings, no further details have been provided at this stage. The principle of residential development in this location is the only aspect to be considered as part of this application.

Relevant Planning History

None relevant.

Consultee Response

United Utilities

Should the applicant receive Planning in Principle permission for this proposal, United Utilities will review the drainage element of any application for Technical Detail Consent in line with the surface water hierarchy. Our consideration of the drainage proposals in line with the drainage hierarchy will be reflected in our response to the Local Planning Authority which is likely to include a suggested condition relating to drainage. Should the applicant propose to connect surface water to the public sewer, we will request evidence to show that the previous options detailed in the hierarchy have been fully investigated and discounted.

The Coal Authority

Our records indicate that the application site is in an area of likely historic unrecorded coal mine workings at shallow depth. It is a requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework, paragraphs 178-179, that the applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the LPA that the application site is safe, stable and suitable for development. We would therefore expect the potential risks posed to surface stability by past coal mining activity to be properly considered and any necessary investigations and remedial works carried out in order to ensure the safety and stability of the development proposed.

On the basis of the above the Coal Authority wish to be consulted on any future technical details consent submitted, should Planning in Principle be granted.

Any application for approval of technical details consent needs to be supported by a Coal Mining Risk Assessment, or equivalent report, which should make an assessment of the coal mining legacy risks present on the site and to inform any remedial works necessary to address any identified land stability issues.

Lancashire Fire and Rescue

No objection.

PBC Countryside Access Officer

The site of the proposed development is crossed by two public footpaths. Public footpath 23 runs along the southern edge of the site and public footpath 24 runs through the site between Kings Causeway and Halifax Road. The planning report is therefore incorrect to state that the loss of the site to outdoor recreation open space is immaterial. The public rights of way in fact allow informal recreation on foot through the site.

Careful consideration will need to be given to the site layout to accommodate the existing footpaths. A wide landscaped corridor should be retained for each footpath in order that the land retains some of its natural characteristics for footpath users. With the land being developed as an urban area the developer should be required to improve the footpaths as made-up paths.

In the event that proposals are made for footpath 24 to be diverted for the site to be developed then the applicant would need to make an application for a public path order. We recommend that the applicant makes a diversion application at the earliest opportunity due to the time scales involved. The developer should pay careful attention to the guidance on the DEFRA Rights of Way Circular 2/93. In particular the applicant must show the existing rights of way on any plans submitted and illustrate how these will be accommodated by the proposed development.

PBC Environmental Health

Whilst no objection is raised, conditions regarding contaminated land and a construction method statement are advised.

Public Response

16 letters of objection were received from neighbouring occupiers, their comments can be summarised as follows:

- Access onto a busy road is unsafe.
- Ruin the appearance of the most scenic approach into the area, with grassed verge and tree lined road side.
- Will ruin access to the existing public footpaths, and the open views enjoyed by walkers.
- Detrimental loss of green space and wildlife habitat.
- Disruption from building works.
- Will result in an eyesore in the countryside and wider landscape.
- Already sufficient development permitted and built within the area.
- The properties will not be in keeping with the area.
- Result in pressure on local services and infrastructure.

Officer Comments

This is an application for a Permission in Principle (“PiP”). This is a form of planning application that has been specifically allowed to come forward as an alternative to normal planning applications.

The scope of permission in principle is limited to location, land use and the amount of development. A decision must be made in accordance with relevant policies in the development plan but based around the three factors. There is no other specific guidance about the way a PiP should be considered other than considering it based on existing prevailing planning policies. A site that benefits from a PiP would then be subject of a further application for approval of technical details. It is regrettable that there has been no adequate guidance on what this would entail but in basic terms a Council can require any necessary details to be considered at the technical stage. The principle could not however be revisited at that stage.

Policy

Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy

Policy SDP1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development) sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development which runs through the plan.

Policy SDP2 (Spatial Development Principles) states that new development within settlement boundaries will be acceptable, unless it is an exception outlined in the Framework or elsewhere in the LPP1.

Policy LIV1 (Housing Provision and Delivery) sets out the housing requirement for Pendle, on allocated sites within settlements.

Policy ENV1 (Protecting and Enhancing Our Natural and Historic Environments) states that the historic environment and heritage assets of the borough (including Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, Scheduled Monuments, non-designated assets and archaeological remains), including and their settings, will be conserved and where appropriate should be enhanced.

Policy ENV2 (Achieving Quality in Design and Conservation) All new development should viably seek to deliver the highest possible standards of design, in form and sustainability, and be designed to meet future demands whilst enhancing and conserving our heritage assets.

Replacement Pendle Local Plan

Saved Policy 31 of the Replacement Pendle Local Plan sets out the maximum parking standards for development.

Policy 33 (Existing Open Space) advises that the loss of open space will only be permitted where it involves poor quality space in areas where there is surplus provision in the particular ward area.

National Planning Policy Framework

The Framework states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. It states that there are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. The policies in the Framework, taken as a whole, constitute the Government's view of what sustainable development in England means in practice for the planning system.

Principle of Development

Policy LIV1 deals with housing provision and delivery. It states that sustainable sites outside, but close to a settlement boundary, which make a positive contribution to the five year supply of housing land will be supported.

The application site is located within the Open Countryside, directly adjacent to the settlement boundary, which adjoins the northern western boundary of the site. The proposed development would be bordered by existing properties on Kings Causeway to the north west and 'Rockwood' to the south east, therefore situated between existing residential development. The location does not give rise to landscape or other unacceptable impacts occurring. The relationship with Brierfield is such that the site would be considered to be in a sustainable location, this being reinforced by

previous committee decisions regarding the proximity of sites to settlements. Therefore, in accordance with Policy LIV1, the principle of residential development on this site is acceptable.

Open Space

The application site is identified within the Pendle Open Space Audit 2019 as designated for Outdoor Sports, as part of Nelson Golf Club.

Open space is defined in the NPPF as being all open space of public value which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation and can act as a visual amenity. This land formed part of the Open Space assessment examined as part of the EIP into the Local Plan, which was found to be sound.

The application site is 0.6 hectares with a quality score of medium (43). Overall the Reedley ward has a surplus of Outdoor Sports of 46.95ha. Therefore, the loss of this site would result in a remaining surplus of 40.95ha, remaining of low priority for increased provision.

The Council seeks to protect those areas of designated open space. Policy 33 of the Replacement Pendle Local Plan states that the loss of open space will only be permitted where; there is the loss of poor quality amenity open space in areas where there is a surplus provision, or replacement open space provision is provided as compensation.

Similarly in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, the applicant must meet one of the defined exceptions, in Paragraph 97 of the NPPF, as follows:

- a) An assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or
- b) The loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or
- c) The development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the benefits of which clearly outweigh the loss of the current or former use.

The application site is one of 8 outdoor sports sites within the Reedley ward. OS064 is a 42ha site which covers all of Nelson Golf Course. The application site forms a very small portion of this, in the north eastern corner of the course. Compared to the rest of the golf course this section is not maintained or manicured to the same standards and is not part of the main course. It is overgrown and partitioned from the main course by a dense hedgerow and public footpath. As a result, the loss of this small piece of open space, would not compromise the outdoor sports provision of the golf club.

The 2019 OSA places a low priority on increasing the provision of outdoor sports space within Reedley and the societal benefits of 6no. residential dwellings would outweigh the loss of the existing outdoor sports space.

Reason for Decision

Section 38 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that applications be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The proposed development is acceptable in principle. There is a positive presumption in favour of approving the development and there are no material reasons to object to the application.

RECOMMENDATION: Approval

INFORMATIVE

As part of a technical details application the following information should be provided:

- Plans, including location plan, site plan, elevation and floor plans.
- Planning Statement.
- Contamination Survey
- Foul and Surface Water Drainage Scheme.
- Ecology Survey.
- Landscaping Scheme.

LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS

Planning Applications

NW/MP

Date: 21st October 2020